

**MORE CONSTRUCTIONS
FOR BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS
SH652**

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

This research was partially supported by the Israel Foundation for Science
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
First Typed - 97/May/12
Latest Revision - 98/May/13

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

ANNOTATED CONTENT

§1 The depth of free product may be bigger than the depths of those multiplied

[We construct, in ZFC, for any Boolean Algebra B , and cardinal κ Boolean Algebras B_1, B_2 extending B such that the depth of the free product of B_1, B_2 over B is strictly larger than the depths of B_1 and of B_2 than κ . Thus, we answer problem 10 of Monk [M]. We give a condition $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$ which implies that for some Boolean Algebra $A = A_\theta$ there are $B_1 = B_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}^1, B_2 = B_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}^2$, $\text{Depth}(B_t) \leq \mu$ and $\text{Depth}(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) \geq \lambda$. We then start to investigate for a fixed A , the existence of such B_1, B_2 ; gives sufficient and necessary conditions, involving consistency results.]

§2 On the family of homomorphic images of a Boolean Algebra

[We prove that e.g. if B is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ , $\lambda \geq \mu$ and λ, μ are strong limit singular of the same cofinality, then B has a homomorphic image of cardinality μ (and with μ ultrafilters).
More generally if $\lambda \geq \mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \text{cf}(\lambda)$ and B a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ , then for some homomorphic image B' of B we have $\mu \leq |B'| \leq 2^{<\mu}$]

§3 If $d(B)$ is small, then depth or independence are not small

[We prove for a Boolean Algebra B , that if $d(B)^\kappa < |B|$, then $\text{ind}(B) > \kappa$ or $\text{Depth}(B) \geq \log(|B|)$.]

§4 On omitting cardinals by compact spaces

$$\mu \leq |B'|$$

§5 Depth of ultraproducts of Boolean Algebras

[We show that if $\square_\lambda$ and $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ then for some Boolean Algebras B_n , $\text{Depth}(B_n) \leq \lambda$ but for any uniform ultrafilter D on ω , $\prod_{n < \omega} B_n / D$ has depth $\geq \lambda^+$.]

§0

We consider some problems

0.1 Problem: Is there a class of cardinals λ (or just two) such that there is a λ^+ -thin tall superatomic Boolean Algebra B (i.e. $|B| = \lambda^+$, B is superatomic and for every $\alpha < \lambda^+$, B has $\leq \lambda$ atoms of order α), or even a λ^+ -tree; provably in ZFC.

Note that if $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ the answer is yes, so for $\lambda = \aleph_0$ there is one. Also note that if there is a λ^+ -tree, then there is such λ^+ -thin tall superatomic Boolean Algebra. The point is that for several problems in Monk [M], 72, 74, 75 and ZFC version of 73, 77, 78, 79 (all solved in [RoSh 599] (in the original version asking for consistency) there is no point to try to get positive answers as long as we do not know it for 0.1.

Also for several problems of [M](49,57,58,61,63,87) there is no point to try to get consistency of non-existence as long as we have not proved the consistency of the GSH (generalized Souslin hypothesis) which says there is no λ^+ -Souslin trees or there is no λ -Souslin tree for $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0$ for some others this is not provable, but it seems that this is very advisable.

0.2 Problem: 1) [M, Problem 28]. Is there a class of (or just one) λ such that some Boolean Algebra B of cardinality λ^+ has irredundancy λ^+ .

2) On irr: can we build a Boolean Algebra B , $\text{irr}(B) < |B| = \lambda^{+n}$, n large enough?

Note that there is no point to try to construct examples as in problems [M] (25,26,65,66,67,73,82,83,85,89) of Monk before we construct one for 0.2(1).

0.3 Question: 1) Is it consistent to have a Boolean Algebra B such that

$$|B| \geq \text{irr}(B)^{++}?$$

2) More general for cardinal invariants with small difference with $|B|$ that is $2^{\text{inv}(B)} \geq |B|$, we should ask e.g. if $|B| < \text{inv}(B)^{+\omega}$.

3) Similarly for $\text{irr}_n(B)$.

0.4 Question: Ultraproduct of length/Depth not near singular.

See §1.

0.5 Question: Investigate $SpDpFP(A)$ for a Boolean Algebra A (see in §1).

0.6 Problem: It is true that for any large enough Boolean Algebra B we have

$$\text{id}(B) = \text{id}(B)^{<\theta} \text{ when e.g. } \theta = \log_2 |B|, \text{ or at least for some constant } n, \theta = \text{Min}\{\mu : \beth_n(\mu) \geq |B|\}.$$

Similarly for compact spaces.

By [Sh 233], for every B there is such n . If you like to try consistency, you have to use the phenomena proved consistent in Gitik Shelah [GiSh 344] (a problem of Hajnal).

0.7 Question: 1) For which pairs (λ, θ) of cardinals $\lambda \geq \theta$ there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with $> \lambda$ elements, λ atoms, and every $f \in \text{Aut}(B) \bmod < \theta$ atoms? (That is $|\{x : B \models "x \text{ an atom and } f(x) \neq x\}| < \theta$).

2) In particular, is it true that for some θ for a class of λ there is such Boolean

Algebra?

3) Replace “automorphism” by “1-to-1 endomorphism”.

4) In particular in [Sh 641, §2] for μ strong limit singular.

See [Sh 641, §2].

[Sh 641, §5] larger difference?

Try: with n depending on arity of the term as in [Sh 641, §6].

Concerning attainment in ZFC:

0.8 Question: 1) Can we show the distinction made between the attainments of variant of hL (and hd), in semi-ZFC way? That is, in Roslanowski Shelah [RoSh 599] such examples are forced. Can we prove such examples exist adding to ZFC only restrictions on cardinal arithmetic?

2) Similarly for other consistency results. (Well, preferably of low consistency strength).

0.9 Question: Let $\theta \geq \aleph_0$ or any cardinal. Is there a class of cardinal $\lambda = \lambda^\theta$ such that there is an entangled linear order of cardinality λ^+ (see [Sh:e, AP2]).

If we omit $\lambda = \lambda^+$, the answer is yes, and we “almost can prove the answer is yes (in ZFC)”, meaning that if the answer is no in V then on cardinal arithmetic there are very severe limitations: on the one hand for no λ , $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ & $\lambda = \lambda^\theta$ (and more) but on the other hand $(\neg(\exists \mu)(\mu^\theta = \mu^\theta \text{ \& } 2^\mu \geq \aleph_{(\mu^{+4})}))$ and more, see [Sh 462, §5].

This is closed connected to

(*) can we have $\text{Inc}(\prod_{i < \theta} B_i / F) > \prod_{i < \theta} \text{Inc}(B_i) / F$ where F is an ultrafilter on κ .

A “yes answer” for the question gives yes to (*).

This paper can be translated to compact topologies.

§1 ON THE DEPTH OF FREE PRODUCTS

Monk [M], Problem 10, 11 ask about the depth of $B \oplus_A C$ (see there for the known results, [M]).

We shall define a spectrum $SpDpFP(A)$ for a Boolean Algebra A (in 1.1) and phrase Monk's question with it (1.2(2),(3)). We then phrase a combinatorial statement $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ and prove it gives examples of B, C extending A while $B \oplus_A C$ has depth larger than both (in 1.5), and note that it (provably in ZFC) holds for many cardinals (with $\lambda = \mu$ near a singular) (in 1.7). Later we note some variants of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ and investigate when the construction in 1.5 works for a Boolean Algebra A , in particular for any infinite Boolean Algebra A , it holds for a class of λ 's.

1.1 Definition. 1) For a Boolean Algebra A , we define the spectrum of depth of free products over A , $SpDpFP(A)$ as

$$\{\kappa : \text{there are Boolean Algebras } B, C \text{ extending } A \text{ such that :} \\ \text{Depth}(B \oplus_A C) > \kappa \geq \text{Depth}(B) + \text{Depth}(A)\}.$$

2) Similarly

$$SpDpFP^+(A) = \{\kappa : \text{there are Boolean Algebras } B, C \text{ extending } A \\ \text{such that } \text{Depth}(B \oplus_A C) \geq \kappa > \text{Depth}(B) + \text{Depth}(A)\}.$$

1.2 Remark. 1) Note that

$$\kappa^+ \in SpDpFP^+(A) \text{ iff } \kappa \in SpDpFP(A)$$

so we can deal with 1.1(2) only.

2) So written in our terms, problem 10 of Monk [M] is:

- (*) for every infinite Boolean Algebra A , $SpDpFP(A)$ is a set of cardinals, i.e. has an upper bound.

3) Written in our terms, problem 11 of Monk is

- (*) for every infinite Boolean Algebra A , $SpDpFP^+(A)$ is non-empty.

4) By 1.5, 1.7 (see (*)₃) below, e.g. for some countable Boolean Algebra A , for every strong limit cardinal μ of cofinality $\aleph_0$, we have $\mu^+ \in SpDpFP^+(A)$ (hence $\mu \in SpDpFP(A)$), so Monk's question 10 is answered.

5) The combinatorial property in $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ is close to one considered for investigating the "bad stationary set of a successor of singulars," and more generally the ideal $I[\lambda]$ in [Sh 108], [Sh 88a], [Sh 420, §1].

We then may ask ourselves:

1.3 Question: What occurs to cardinals which are not “near singular” (e.g. $\lambda = \mu = \chi^+$, $\chi = \chi^{<\chi} > 2^{|A|}$).

1.4 Question: Can you say more on $SpDpFP^+(A)$ when we are given A ?

We give some information concerning those problems.

1.5 Claim. *Assume*

$\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}(a)$ $\theta < \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \mu \leq \lambda$

- (b) $\mathbf{c} : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ satisfies: if $\zeta_1 < \zeta_2 < \zeta_3 < \lambda$, then $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_1, \zeta_3\} \leq \text{Max}\{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_1, \zeta_2\}, \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_2, \zeta_3\}\}$,
- (c) if $n < \omega$, $w_\alpha \in [\lambda]^n$ for $\alpha < \mu$, then we can find α, β, i, j such that $\alpha < \beta < \mu$, $w_\alpha = \{\zeta_\ell : \ell < n\}$ increasing, $w_\beta = \{\xi_\ell : \ell < n\}$ increasing, $\zeta_\ell = \xi_k \Rightarrow \ell = k$, $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \zeta_k\} = \mathbf{c}\{\xi_\ell, \xi_k\}$ for $\ell < k < n$ and for some $i < j$ satisfy $i \geq \sup\{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \zeta_k\}, \mathbf{c}\{\xi_\ell, \xi_k\} : \ell, k < n\}$ we have: for $\ell, k < n$ one of the following occurs: $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \xi_k\} \geq j$ & $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_k, \xi_\ell\} \geq j$ or $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \xi_k\} = \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_k, \xi_\ell\} < j$ & $[\zeta_\ell < \xi_k \leftrightarrow \xi_\ell < \zeta_k]$
- (d) $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) = \sup(\text{Rang}(\mathbf{c}))$
- (e) in clause (c) we can demand $i \geq i(*)$ for any pregiven $i(*) < \theta$.

Then for any $\kappa \in [\theta, \mu)$ we can find Boolean Algebras A, B_1, B_2 such that:

- (α) $|A| = \kappa$, A depend just on θ and κ
- (β) $|B_1| = |B_2| = \lambda$
- (γ) $\text{Depth}^+(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) = \lambda^+$
- (δ) $\text{Depth}^+(B_1) \leq \mu$ and $\text{Depth}^+(B_2) \leq \mu$
- (δ)⁺ moreover, $\text{Length}^+(B_i) \leq \mu$ for $i = 1, 2$.

1.6 Remark. 1) Let $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}^-$ just means (a), (b), (c), (e), i.e. omitting clause (d). So by 1.9(3) below $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}^- \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\sigma \leq \theta} \boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\sigma}$ and there are obvious monotonicity properties.

2) Really we can omit i in clause (c) of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$, see proof.

3) Let $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}^+$ means that in the definition of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ in clause (c), when $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \xi_k\} \geq j$ & $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_k, \xi_\ell\} \geq j$ we add $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_\ell, \xi_k\} = \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_k, \xi_\ell\}$.

In 1.7 below we can get this version by working a little more.

We quote [Sh:g]

1.7 Observation. The demand on $\theta < \mu \leq \lambda$ is not hard, in fact we can find $\mathbf{c}$ such that clauses (b), (c), (d), (e) of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ hold if the cardinals θ, μ, λ satisfies at least one of the following statements:

$$(*)_1 \text{ for some } \chi \in (\theta, \mu) \text{ we have } \bigwedge_{\alpha < \chi} |\alpha|^{<\theta} < \chi, \text{cf}(\chi) = \theta, \text{pp}_{J_\theta^{\text{bd}}}^+(\chi) > \lambda$$

or

- (*)₂ $\theta > \aleph_0, \theta = \text{cf}(\chi), \bigwedge_{\alpha < \chi} |\alpha|^\theta < \chi, \chi < \mu \leq \lambda \leq \chi^\theta$
- (*)₃ $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) \geq \mu > \chi > \text{cf}(\chi) = \theta, \langle \chi_i : i < \theta \rangle$ is strictly increasing with limit χ , $\max \text{pcf}\{\chi_j : j < i\} < \chi$ (or just $< \mu$) and $\prod_{i < \theta} \chi_i / J_\theta^{bd}$ has true cofinality $= \lambda$ (or just there is a $<_{J_\theta^{bd}}$ -increasing sequence in the product for every regular $\lambda' \in (\chi, \lambda]$)
- (*)₄ if $\aleph_0 < \text{cf}(\sigma) = \sigma = \text{cf}(\chi) < \chi$, and $(\forall \alpha < \chi)(\text{cf}([\alpha]^{\leq \sigma}, \subseteq) < \chi)$ and $\sigma^{\aleph_0} < \chi$, then for some club C of χ , $\chi_1 \in \{\chi\} \cup C$ & $\lambda = \text{cf}([\chi_1]^{\leq \sigma}, \subseteq)$ & $\mu = \chi_1^+$ & $\theta = \text{cf}(\chi_1) \Rightarrow \boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$.

Proof. For (*)₁ Let $\chi = \sum_{i < \theta} \chi_i$, with $\chi_i = \text{cf}(\chi_i) < \chi, \theta = \text{cf}(\chi)$ and in $\prod_{i < \theta} \chi_i$ we can find a $<_{J_\theta^{bd}}$ -increasing sequence $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that $|\{\eta_\alpha \upharpoonright i : \alpha < \lambda\}| \leq \chi$ (really $< \mu$ suffice: if λ is regular; by the definition of J_θ^{bd} ; if λ is singular by combining such examples for regular (and [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.5]). For $\alpha < \beta$ let $\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\} = \text{Min}\{i < \theta : (\forall j \in [i, \theta))(\eta_\alpha(i) < \eta_\beta(i))\}$.

Let us check

Clause (a): By the assumptions on θ, μ, λ clearly $\theta < \chi < \mu \leq \lambda$; note that we do not demand $\theta < \text{cf}(\mu)$.

Clause (b): Clearly $\mathbf{c}$ is a function from $[\lambda]^2$ to θ . Now suppose $\alpha < \beta < \gamma < \lambda$ and $i = \mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\}$ and $j = \mathbf{c}\{\beta, \gamma\}$ hence: $\max\{i, j\} \leq \zeta < \theta \Rightarrow \eta_\alpha(\zeta) < \eta_\beta(\zeta) < \eta_\gamma(\zeta)$ hence $\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \gamma\} \leq \max\{i, j\}$ as required.

Clause (c), (e): So suppose $n < \omega$ and $w_\alpha \in [\lambda]^n$ for $\alpha < \mu$. Let $w_\alpha = \{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} : \ell < n_\alpha\}$ with $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_{\alpha, \ell+1}$ and $i(*) < \theta$.

Also without loss of generality for some $v \subseteq n$: (just shrink the set for each $\ell < n$)

- ⊗₁ if $\ell \in v$ then $\langle \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} : \alpha < \chi^+ \rangle$ is strictly increasing with limit ζ_ℓ^*
- ⊗₂ if $\ell < n, \ell \notin v$ then $\langle \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} : \alpha < \chi^+ \rangle$ is constantly ζ_ℓ^* .

We can also demand

- ⊗₃ if $\ell \in v, m < n$ the truth value of $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} > \zeta_m^*, \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_m^*$ does not depend on α
- ⊗₄ if $\ell \neq m$ are from v and $\zeta_\ell^* = \zeta_m^*$ then $\alpha < \beta < \chi^+ \Rightarrow \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_{\beta, m}$.

For each $\alpha < \mu^{\chi^+}$ let $i_\alpha = \text{Max}\{\{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta, \xi\} : \zeta \neq \xi \in w_\alpha \cup \{\zeta_\ell^* : \ell < n\}\} \cup \{i(*)\}\}$, now clearly $i_\alpha < \theta$ so as $\text{cf}(\chi^+) > \theta, \chi^+ \leq \mu$ (by clause (a) or more exactly by our assumptions) without loss of generality $i_\alpha = i^*$ for $\alpha < \chi^+$. As $\langle \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}}(i^*+1) : \ell < n \rangle$ have only $\leq (\chi^{i^*+1})^n < \chi$ possible values, without loss of generality $\alpha < \chi^+ \Rightarrow \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}}(i^*+1) = \gamma_\ell$, moreover $\alpha < \chi^+ \Rightarrow \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}} \upharpoonright (i^*+2) = \nu_\ell$.

Also without loss of generality

⊗₅ for every $\alpha < \chi^+$ and finite $u \subseteq \theta$, for χ^+ ordinals $\beta < \chi^+$ we have

$$\bigwedge_{i \in u} \bigwedge_{\ell < n} f_{\zeta_{\beta, \ell}}(i) = f_{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}}(i).$$

Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \chi^+$, so we can find $j^* \in (i(*) + 2, \theta)$ such that $\{\ell, m\} \subseteq v$ & $\zeta_\ell^* = \zeta_m^* \Rightarrow f_{\zeta_{\alpha_1, \ell}}(j^*) < f_{\zeta_{\alpha_2, \ell}}(j^*)$. Choose $\alpha_3 \in (\alpha_2, \chi^+)$ such that $\bigwedge_{\ell} f_{\zeta_{\alpha_3, \ell}}(j^*) = f_{\zeta_{\alpha_1, \ell}}(j^*)$. Now let $\alpha =: \alpha_2, \beta =: \alpha_3, i = i^*, j = i^* + 1$, they are as required.
 Why?

- ⊗₆ assume $\ell \neq m$ are $< n$ and $\zeta_\ell^* \neq \zeta_m^*$ then we have: $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\beta, m}\} = \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\beta, m}, \zeta_{\alpha, \ell}\}$ is determined by ν_ℓ, ν_m and is $\leq i^* = i$. Also $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_{\beta, m} \leftrightarrow \zeta_{\beta, \ell} < \zeta_{\alpha, m}$.
 [Why? E.g. if $\zeta_\ell^* < \zeta_m^*$ for $i \in [i^*, \theta)$ we have $f_{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}}(i) \leq f_{\zeta_\ell^*}(i) < f_{\zeta_{\beta, m}}(i)$, so $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\beta, m}\} \leq i^*$, noticing $i_\alpha = i_\beta \leq i^*$, (and the choice of i_α and ⊗₅ above).]
- ⊗₇ if $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} \neq \zeta_{\beta, \ell}$ (i.e. $\ell \in v$) then $\mathbf{c}(\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\beta, \ell}) \geq j^*$
 [why? by the choice of j^* we have $f_{\beta, \ell}(j^*) = f_{\alpha_1, \ell}(j^*) < f_{\alpha, \ell}(j^*)$ and by the choice of β we have $\alpha < \beta$.]
- ⊗₈ if $\ell \neq m < n, \zeta_\ell^* = \zeta_m^*$ and $\{\ell, m\} \subseteq v$ then $\mathbf{c}(\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\beta, m}) \geq j^* > j$
 [why? clearly $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_{\beta, m}$ as $\alpha < \beta$ (see ⊗₄) and
 $\eta_{\zeta_{\beta, m}}(j^*) = \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha_3, m}}(j^*) = \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha_1, m}}(j^*) < \eta_{\zeta_{\alpha_2, \ell}}(j^*) = \eta_{\zeta_{\beta, \ell}}(j^*)$.]
- ⊗₉ if $\ell \neq m < n, \zeta_\ell^* = \zeta_m^*$ and $\{\ell, m\} \not\subseteq v$, then $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\beta, \ell}\} \leq i^*$. Also $[\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \zeta_{\beta, m} \leftrightarrow \zeta_{\beta, \ell} < \zeta_{\alpha, m}]$.
 [why? clearly $\{\ell, m\} \cap v = \emptyset$ is impossible, and so $|\{\ell, m\} \cap v| = 1$; now the proof is similar to that of ⊗₆.]

Together we are done.

For $(*)_2$:

By [Sh:g, Ch.II, 5.4(2), Ch.VIII, §1] the assumptions in $(*)_1$ holds.

For $(*)_3$:

By [Sh:g, Ch.II, 3.5] we can choose $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, \eta_\alpha \in {}^\theta \chi, \bar{\eta}$ is $<_{J_\theta^{bd}}$ -increasing, and $|\{\eta_\alpha \restriction i : \alpha < \lambda\}| \leq \chi$ for $i < \theta$ (again for singulars we combine examples).
 For λ singular combine such examples.

For $(*)_4$:

See [Sh:E11].

Proof of 1.5.

Stage A: Let A be the Boolean Algebra generated by $\{a_i^t : i < \kappa \text{ and } t \in \{1, 2\}\}$ freely except the equations:

- (*)₁ $a_i^t \leq a_j^t$ for $i \leq j < \theta$ and $t \in \{1, 2\}$
- (*)₂ $a_i^1 \cap a_j^2 = 0$ for $i, j < \theta$.

Let I^t be the ideal of A generated by $\{a_i^t : i < \theta\}$ for $t = 1, 2$. Let I be the ideal of A generated by $I^1 \cup I^2$ so A/I is the trivial (= two elements) Boolean Algebra.

For $t = 1, 2$ let B_t be the extension of A by $\{x_\alpha^t : \alpha < \lambda\}$ freely except that:

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_3 \quad x_\alpha^t - x_\beta^t &\leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\}}^t && \text{for } \alpha < \beta < \lambda \\ (*)_4 \quad x_\alpha^t \cap a_i^{3-t} &= 0 && \text{for } \alpha < \lambda, i < \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B = B_1 \oplus_A B_2$ and let $x_\alpha = x_\alpha^1 \cap x_\alpha^2 \in B$. Let J^1, J^2, J be the ideal of B which I^1, I^2, I generates (resp.),
Clearly $|B| \leq \lambda$.

Stage B: $\text{Depth}^+(B) = \lambda^+$.

Clearly $\text{Depth}^+(B) \leq |B|^+ \leq \lambda^+$. Hence it suffices to prove $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is strictly increasing. So let $\alpha < \beta$. First we prove $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$. Let D be an ultrafilter on B (so $D_t = D \cap B_t \in \text{Ult}(B_t)$ and $D_1 \cap A = D_2 \cap A$), and we shall prove $x_\alpha \in D \Rightarrow x_\beta \in D$. This suffices for proving $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$ (as D was any ultrafilter).

Case 1: $D \cap A$ is disjoint to I .

Now modulo J^t in B^t , $x_\alpha^t \leq x_\beta^t$ hence modulo J , $x_\alpha^t \leq x_\beta^t$ hence mod J , $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$ hence $x_\alpha \in D \Rightarrow x_\beta \in D$.

Case 2: $D \cap A$ is not disjoint to I .

So $D \cap I \neq \emptyset$ hence for some $t \in \{1, 2\}$ and $i < \theta$, $a_i^t \in D$, but x_α^{3-t} is disjoint to a_i^t by $(*)_4$, so $x_\alpha^{3-t} \notin D$ hence $x_\alpha = x_\alpha^1 \cap x_\alpha^2 \notin D$ so trivially $x_\alpha \in D \Rightarrow x_\beta \in D$.

We still have to prove $x_\alpha \neq x_\beta$. Let D_β^t be the ultrafilter on B^t generated by $x_\gamma^t (\gamma \geq \beta), -x_\gamma^t (\gamma < \beta), -a_i^s (i < \theta, s \in \{1, 2\})$ (check that it is okay trivially). Now $D_\beta^1 \cap A = I = D_\beta^2 \cap A$ (check, trivial). So there is an ultrafilter D on B , $D \cap B_t = D_\beta^t$. So $-x_\alpha^t, x_\beta^t \in D_\beta^t$ so $-x_\alpha, x_\beta \in D$ as required.

Stage C: $\text{Length}^+(B_t) \leq \mu$.

Assume not, so we can find $\langle c_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ a chain (so with no repetition). Let $c_\alpha = \tau_\alpha(a_{i_{\alpha,1}}^{s_{\alpha,1}}, \dots, a_{i_{\alpha,k_\alpha}}^{s_{\alpha,k_\alpha}}, k_\alpha, x_{\zeta_{\alpha,1}}^t \dots x_{\zeta_{\alpha,n_\alpha}}^t)$ where $i_{\alpha,1} < \dots < i_{\alpha,k_\alpha} < \kappa$ and $\zeta_{\alpha,1} < \dots < \zeta_{\alpha,n_\alpha} < \lambda$ and $s_{\alpha,1}, \dots, s_{\alpha,k_\alpha} \in \{1, 2\}$ and τ_α a Boolean term.

As $\text{cf}(\mu) > \theta \geq \aleph_0$, without loss of generality:

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_5 \quad k_\alpha &= k^*, n_\alpha = n^*, \tau_\alpha = \tau^*, s_{\alpha,\ell} = s_\ell. \\ (*)_6 \quad &\text{for some } m^* \leq k^* \text{ we have:} \\ (i) \quad &0 < \ell \leq m^* \Rightarrow i_{\alpha,\ell} = i_\ell < \theta \\ (ii) \quad &\ell \in (m^*, k^*] \Rightarrow i_{\alpha,\ell} \geq \theta \\ (iii) \quad &\text{for } \alpha < \beta < \mu, \text{ for some } v = v_{\alpha,\beta} \subseteq (m^*, k^*] \text{ we have} \\ (a) \quad &\ell \in v \Rightarrow i_{\alpha,\ell} = i_{\beta,\ell} \text{ and} \\ (b) \quad &\ell \in (m^*, k^*] \ \& \ \ell \notin v \text{ implies } i_{\alpha,\ell} \neq i_{\beta,\ell} \\ &\text{and are not in } \{i_{\alpha,k}, i_{\beta,k} : k \neq \ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

[why $(*)_2$? if μ is regular, by the Δ -system lemma (so then $w_{\alpha,\beta} = w$) and if singular, apply it twice.]

Let $i(*) = \sup\{i_\ell : \ell < m^*\}$ so $i(*) < \theta$.

Let $w_\alpha = \{\zeta_{\alpha,1}, \dots, \zeta_{\alpha,n^*}\}$. Let $\alpha \neq \beta < \mu$ and $i < j < \theta$ be as guaranteed by clause (c) of the assumption and $i > i(*)$ (see clause (e)). So c_α, c_β are distinct members of a chain of B_t .

Now read Stage D below.

So let $w =: \{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}, \zeta_{\beta,\ell} : \ell = 1, \dots, n\} \in [\lambda]^{<\aleph_0}$.

By Stage D, $B_{t,w}$ is a subalgebra of B_t and $c_\alpha, c_\beta \in B_{t,w}$, hence also in $B_{t,w}, c_\alpha, c_\beta$ are distinct members of a chain.

By symmetry assume $B_{t,w} \models "c_\alpha < c_\beta"$, hence there is a homomorphism f from $B_{t,w}$ to (the trivial Boolean algebra) $\{0,1\}$ such that $f(c_\alpha) = 0, f(c_\beta) = 1$. Let $\gamma(f) = \min\{\gamma \leq \kappa : \text{if } \gamma < \theta \text{ then } f(a_\gamma^t) = 1\}$.

As in the Boolean Algebra $A \subseteq B^t, \langle a_\gamma^t : \gamma < \theta \rangle$ is increasing, clearly

$$(*)_7 \text{ for } \xi < \theta, f(a_\xi^t) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \xi \geq \gamma(f)$$

$$(*)_8 \text{ for } \xi < \theta, f(a_\xi^{3-t}) = 0$$

[why? otherwise $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow f(x_\alpha^t) = 0$ by $(*)_4$, hence $f(x_{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}}^t) = 0 = f(x_{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}}^t)$.

Now let $g : \{a_i^1, a_i^2 : i < \kappa\} \cup \{x_\alpha^t : \alpha < \lambda\} \rightarrow B_t$ be defined as follows: $g(a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell}, g(a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}$ and otherwise it is the identity so $i < \theta$ & $s \in \{1,2\} \Rightarrow g(a_i^s) = a_i^s$. By the assumption toward contradiction and $(*)$ of Stage D, g induces a homomorphism $\hat{g}$ from B_t to B_t , clearly it is an automorphism, so $f \circ \hat{g}$ is a homomorphism from B_t to $\{0,1\}$ and: $(f \circ \hat{g})(c_\alpha) = f(\hat{g}(c_\alpha)) = f(c_\beta) = 1, (f \circ \hat{g})(c_\beta) = f(\hat{g}(c_\beta)) = f(c_\beta) = 0$ contradicting $B_t \models c_\alpha < c_\beta$]

Now

$(*)_9$ the function $g : \{a_i^s : i < \kappa, s \in \{1,2\}\} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ induce a homomorphism $\hat{g}$ from A to $\{0,1\}$ where g is defined by:

$$(i) \quad g(a_\xi^t) = f(a_\xi^t) \text{ for } \xi < j$$

$$(ii) \quad g(a_\xi^t) = 1 \text{ if } \xi \geq j, \xi < \theta$$

$$(iii) \quad g(a_\xi^{3-t}) = f(a_\xi^{3-t}) = 0 \text{ for } \xi < \theta$$

$$(iv) \quad g(a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = f(a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell}), g(a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = f(a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, k^*$$

$$(v) \quad g(a_i^s) = f(a_i^s) \text{ if } a_i^s \notin \{a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}, a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell} : \ell = 1, \dots, k^*\} \text{ and } i \in [\theta, \kappa)$$

[why? now g is well defined as, e.g. for contradiction concerns (iii), two instances do not contradict by $(*)_6(iii)$ and they do not contradict others by $(*)_6(i) + (ii)$. By $(*)$ of Stage D below we should check the equations appearing in the definition of A . For those in $(*)_1$, i.e. $a_\varepsilon^s \leq a_\xi^s$ for $\varepsilon < \xi$, if $s = 3 - t$ this is trivial by clause (iii), if $s = t, \xi \geq j$, this is trivial by clause (ii) and if $s = t, \xi < j$, then $g(a_\varepsilon^s) = f(a_\varepsilon^s) \leq f(a_\xi^s) = g(a_\xi^s)$.

As for the equations in $(*)_2$ that is $a_\varepsilon^1 \cap a_\xi^2 = 0$ for $\varepsilon, \xi < \theta$ they are preserved trivially by $(*)_7$ and clause (iii).]

Define a function h from $A \cup \{x_{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}}, x_{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}} : \ell = 1, \dots, n^*\}$ to $\{0, 1\}$ as follows: $h \upharpoonright A$ is the homomorphism $\hat{g}$ to $\{0, 1\}$. Now define $h(x_{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}}) = f(x_{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}})$ and $h(x_{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}}) = f(x_{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}})$. Now

- (*)₁₀ h induces a homomorphism $\hat{h}$ from $B_{t,w}$ to $\{0, 1\}$
 [why? by (*)₆ the function h is well defined; we use (*) of Stage D: now
- (a) the equations in A are respected by the choice of $h \upharpoonright A$ as g (and g being a homomorphism)
 - (b) the equations $x_{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}}^t \cap a_i^{3-t} = 0$ for $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$.
 This is respected as $h(a_i^{3-t}) = g(a_i^{3-t}) = 0$.
 - (c) for $\gamma \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ the equation $x_{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}}^t - x_{\zeta_{\gamma,m}}^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\}}^t$ for $\ell < m$.
 Let δ be such that $\{\gamma, \delta\} = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and remember that $i \geq \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\} = \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}$ (by the choice of α, β, i, j) so $h(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\}}^t) = f(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\}}^t) = f(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t)$ by the choice of $h \upharpoonright A$ hence

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}}^t) - h(x_{\zeta_{\gamma,m}}^t) &= f(x_{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}}^t) - f(x_{\zeta_{\delta,m}}^t) \\ &= f(x_{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}}^t - x_{\zeta_{\delta,m}}^t) \leq f(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t) \\ &= h(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\}}^t) \end{aligned}$$

- (d) if $\ell, m \in \{1, \dots, m^*\}$ and $\gamma \neq \delta \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and $\zeta_{\gamma,\ell} < \zeta_{\delta,m}$ the equation $x_{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}}^t - x_{\zeta_{\delta,m}}^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t$.
 Now we have to look at clause (c) of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ of 1.5, there are two possibilities

possibility 1: $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\} \geq j$ (but necessarily $< \theta$), then $g(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t) = 1$ by clause (ii) of (*)₉ so the equation is respected.

possibility 2: $\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\} = \mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\gamma,m}\} \leq i$ hence $[\zeta_{\gamma,\ell} < \zeta_{\delta,m} \Leftrightarrow \zeta_{\delta,\ell} < \zeta_{\gamma,m}]$
 (read (c) of $\boxtimes_{\lambda,\mu,\theta}$ so both holds).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So } h(x_{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}}^t) - h(x_{\zeta_{\delta,m}}^t) &= f(x_{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}}^t) - f(x_{\zeta_{\gamma,m}}^t) = f(x_{\zeta_{\delta,\ell}}^t - x_{\zeta_{\gamma,m}}^t) \\ &\leq f(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t) = g(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t) = h(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta_{\gamma,\ell}, \zeta_{\delta,m}\}}^t). \end{aligned}$$

So we have proved (*)₁₀.]

Now we have two homomorphisms $f, \hat{h}$ from $B_{t,w}$ to $\{0, 1\}$ and they satisfy:

- (*)₁₁ (a) $f(a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = \hat{h}(a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell})$
 (b) $f(a_{i_{\beta,\ell}}^{s_\ell}) = \hat{h}(a_{i_{\alpha,\ell}}^{s_\ell})$
 (c) $f(x_{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}}^t) = \hat{h}(x_{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}}^t)$

- (d) $f(x_{\zeta\beta,\ell}^t) = \hat{h}(x_{\zeta\alpha,\ell}^t)$
 [why? for (a) + (b) not $\hat{h} \upharpoonright A = g \upharpoonright A$ and $(*)_9(iv)$ for (c) + (d) just see the choice of h .]

So clearly $f(c_\alpha) = \hat{h}(c_\beta)$, $f(c_\beta) = \hat{h}(c_\alpha)$, but $f(c_\alpha) = 0 < f(c_\beta) = 1$ so $\hat{h}(c_\beta) = 0 < \hat{h}(c_\alpha) = 1$ whereas we assume $B_{w,t} \models c_\alpha < c_\beta$, contradiction.

So we have finished the proof of Stage C, hence of 1.5 except a debt: Stage D.

Stage D: First recall

- (*) if a Boolean algebra B is defined by: generated freely by $\{x_i : i < i^*\}$ except the set of equations Γ , and B' another Boolean Algebra and the function $h : \{x_i : i < i^*\} \rightarrow B'$ respect the equations in Γ (i.e. if $\tau'_i(x_{i_1}, \dots) = \tau''(x_{j_1}, \dots) \in \Gamma$ then $B' \models \tau'(h(x_{i_1}), \dots) = \tau''(h(x_{j_1}), \dots)$) then h can be extended to a homomorphism from B to B' (and we call it $\hat{h}$), similarly for “extensions of a Boolean Algebra A ”.

For $w \subseteq \lambda$ let $B_{t,w}$ be defined just like B_t restricting ourselves to $\alpha \in w$ (so also in the set of equations we consider involve only $\alpha, \beta \in w$).

A priori it is not guaranteed that $w \subseteq u \subseteq \lambda \Rightarrow B_{t,w} \subseteq B_{t,u}$. Note $B_t = B_{t,\lambda}$.

Fact. For $w \subseteq u \subseteq \lambda$, $B_{t,w} \subseteq B_{t,u}$ and $B_{t,u}$ is the direct limit of $\{B_{t,w} : w \subseteq u \text{ finite}\}$.

Proof. It is enough to prove this for finite u , so we can ignore the second phrase as it follows. The first phrase we prove by induction on $|u \setminus w|$, so without loss of generality $|u \setminus w| = 1$, let $\zeta \in u \setminus w$.

We define $h : A \cup \{x_i^t : i \in u\} \rightarrow B_{t,w}$,

$$h \upharpoonright A = \text{identity}$$

$$h(x_i^t) = x_i^t \text{ if } i \in w$$

$$h(x_\zeta^t) = \cup \{x_\xi^t - a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta,\xi\}}^t : \xi \in w \cap \zeta\}.$$

Now h is as in (*) (see beginning of stage D, checked below) so there is a homomorphism from $B_{t,u}$ to $B_{t,w}$ which obviously extends the identity so we are done. Why is h as required in (*)? We check the “new” equations, i.e. the ones appearing in the definition of $B_{t,u}$ and not in the definition of $B_{t,w}$ (which are satisfied as $h \upharpoonright B_{t,w}$ is the identity:

- (i) $x_\zeta^t \cap a_j^{3-t} = 0$
 [why? obvious by the choice of $h(x_\zeta^t)$ as $h(x_\zeta^t) \cap h(a_j^{3-t}) = h(x_\zeta^t) \cap a_j^{3-t} \leq (\bigcup_{\xi \in w \cap \zeta} h(x_\xi^t)) \cap a_j^{3-t} = \bigcup_{\xi \in w \cap \zeta} h(x_\xi^t) \cap a_j^{3-t} = \bigcup_{\xi \in w \cap \zeta} 0 = 0$ so (i) holds]
- (ii) if $\varepsilon < \zeta, \varepsilon \in w$, then the equation $x_\varepsilon^t - x_\zeta^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon,\zeta\}}^t$
 [why? by the choice of $h(x_\zeta^t)$ clearly $h(x_\varepsilon^t) - h(x_\zeta^t) = x_\varepsilon^t - h(x_\zeta^t) \leq x_\varepsilon^t - (x_\varepsilon^t - a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta,\varepsilon\}}^t) \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon,\zeta\}}^t = h(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon,\zeta\}}^t)$ so (ii) holds]

(iii) if $\varepsilon > \zeta, \varepsilon \in w$, then the equation $x_\zeta^t - x_\varepsilon^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon, \zeta\}}^t$
[why? the meaning of the demand is that we should check

$$h(x_\zeta^t) - h(x_\varepsilon^t) \leq h(a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon, \zeta\}}^t)$$

that is

$$h(x_\zeta^t) - x_\varepsilon^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon, \zeta\}}^t$$

that is

$$\xi \in w \cap \zeta \Rightarrow (x_\xi^t - a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta, \xi\}}^t) - x_\varepsilon^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\varepsilon, \zeta\}}^t$$

for this it suffices to show

$$\xi \in w \cap \zeta \Rightarrow B_{t,w} \models x_\xi^t - x_\varepsilon^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\xi, \zeta\}}^t \cup a_{\mathbf{c}\{\zeta, \varepsilon\}}^t$$

but we know

$$\xi < \zeta \ \& \ \xi \in w \ \& \ \zeta \in w \Rightarrow B_{t,w} \models x_\xi^t - x_\varepsilon^t \leq a_{\mathbf{c}\{\xi, \varepsilon\}}^t$$

and $\langle a_i^t : i < \theta \rangle$ is increasing and

$$\mathbf{c}\{\xi, \varepsilon\} \leq \text{Max}\{\mathbf{c}\{\xi, \zeta\}, \mathbf{c}\{\zeta, \varepsilon\}\}$$

so we are done.] □_{1.5}

1.8 Observation. 1) Assume

(*) $\lambda = \mu$ is weakly compact $> \kappa$.

If A is a Boolean Algebra, $A \subseteq B_1, A \subseteq B_2, B = B_1 \oplus_A B_2, |A| \leq \kappa$ and:

$\text{Depth}^+(B) > \lambda$ or just $\text{Length}^+(B) > \lambda$, then $\bigvee_{t=1}^2 \text{Depth}^+(B_t) > \mu$.

2) Similarly if $\lambda \rightarrow (\mu)_{\kappa}^2, \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\kappa$.

Proof. We can find distinct $c_\alpha \in B$ (non-zero) for $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow c_\alpha, c_\beta$ comparable in B .

For each α we can find $b_{\alpha, \ell}^t \in B_t$ ($\ell < n_\alpha, t = 1, 2$) such that $c_\alpha = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{n_\alpha-1} (b_{\alpha, \ell}^1 \cap b_{\alpha, \ell}^2)$.

Without loss of generality $\langle b_{\alpha, \ell}^2 : \ell < n_\alpha \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint (in B_2). Without loss of generality $n_\alpha = n(*)$.

For each $\alpha < \lambda$ there is an ultrafilter D_α of B such that

$$c_\alpha \in D_\alpha, \bigwedge_{\beta < \lambda} [c_\beta <_B c_\alpha \Rightarrow c_\beta \notin D_\alpha]$$

(remember: $\{c_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is a chain in B).

As $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\kappa \geq 2^{|A|}$, without loss of generality $\bigwedge_{\alpha < \lambda} D_\alpha \cap A = D^*$. Let $I^* = \{a \in A : 1_A - a \in D^*\}$, it is a maximal ideal of A . Let I_t be the ideal which I^* generates in B_t and I is the ideal which I^* generates in B . So easily $\langle c_\alpha/I : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a chain with no repetition. Now easily $B/I = (B_1/I_1) \oplus (B_2/I_2)$; as in B/I there is a chain of cardinality λ , by Monk McKenzie [MoMc] this holds in B_1/I_1 or in B_2/I_2 , so without loss of generality in B_1/I_1 say it is $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$. Now for some $a_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} \in I^*$, if $b_\alpha/I_1 < b_\beta/I_1$ then

$$B_1 \models b_\alpha - a_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} < b_\beta - a_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}.$$

So it is enough to find $X \in [\lambda]^\mu$ and $a \in A$ and truth value $\mathbf{t}$ such that $a_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} = a$ & $[B \models c_\alpha < c_\beta \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{t} = \text{truth}]$ for $\alpha < \beta \in X$ which we can. So $\langle b_\alpha - a : \alpha \in X \rangle$ or $\langle 1 - (b_\alpha - a) : \alpha \in X \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of order type λ . (Of course, for the version with depth not length, $\mathbf{t}$ is redundant. In more details for each $\alpha < \beta$ choose if possible $\ell = \ell_{\alpha, \beta} < n(*)$ and $a = a_{\alpha, \beta} \in A \setminus \{0\}$ such that $b_{\alpha, \ell}^1 \cap a, b_{\beta, \ell}^1 \cap a$ are distinct but comparable and $\mathbf{t}_{\alpha, \beta} \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $b_{\alpha, \ell_\beta}^1 < b_{\alpha, \ell_\beta}^1 \equiv \mathbf{t}_{\alpha, \beta} = 1$. Define a colouring $c : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow A \times n \times 3$ by: if $a_{\alpha, \beta}, \ell_{\alpha, \beta}$ are well defined, $c\{\alpha, \beta\} = (a_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}, \ell_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}, \mathbf{t}_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}) \in A \times n \times 2$, if not, $c\{\alpha, \beta\} = (0, 0, 2)$. It is enough to note

- (*) for no $X \in [\lambda]^{(2^{|A|})^+}$ is $c \upharpoonright [X]^2$ constantly $(0, 0, 2)$.
 [Why? Otherwise, without loss of generality $X = (2^{|A|})^+$ and repeat the proof above for it.] $\square_{1.8}$

1.9 Claim. 1) In 1.5 we may replace in clauses (b), (c) of the assumption the usual order of the ordinals by a linear order $<^*$, provided that we weaken clause (γ) of the conclusion by

$$(\gamma)^- \text{Length}^+(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) = \lambda^+$$

- 2) In $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$ of 1.5, we can omit clause (e) as it follows.
 3) If $\mathbf{c}, \lambda, \mu, \theta$ satisfies (a), (b), (c) of $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$ and $\text{Rang}(\mathbf{c})$ has no last element, then for some regular $\sigma \leq \theta$ we have $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \sigma}$.
 4) If $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$ and $\mu \leq \mu_1 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda$, then $\boxtimes_{\lambda_1, \mu_1, \theta}$.

Proof. 1) Same proof as in 1.5.

2) Add to w_α dummy members to increase i (and included in the next proof).

3) Let $\delta^* = \sup \text{Rang}(\mathbf{c})$, and let $\sigma = \text{cf}(\delta^*)$ and $\langle \gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma \rangle$ be increasing continuously with limit δ^* , a limit ordinal. Define $\mathbf{c}' : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \sigma$ by $\mathbf{c}'\{\alpha, \beta\} = \text{Min}\{\varepsilon < \sigma : \mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\} < \gamma_\varepsilon\}$ so $\mathbf{c}'\{\alpha, \beta\}$ is always a successor ordinal.

Let us prove (c) + (e). So let $\varepsilon(*) < \sigma$ and let $w_\alpha = \{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} : \ell < n\}, \zeta_{\alpha, 0} < \zeta_{\alpha, 1} < \dots < \zeta_{\alpha, n-1} < \lambda$ for $\alpha < \mu$. Let $\varepsilon_\alpha = \max\{\mathbf{c}'\{\zeta_{\alpha, \ell}, \zeta_{\alpha, m}\} : \ell < m < n\}$ and as $\text{cf}(\mu) > \sigma$ (so $\text{cf}(\mu) > \theta$ is an overkill) without loss of generality ε_α is constant so $\varepsilon^* = \max\{\varepsilon(*) + 1, \varepsilon_\alpha + 1 : \alpha < \lambda\} < \sigma$, so as $\delta^* = \sup(\text{Rang } \mathbf{c})$, for some $\alpha^* < \beta^* < \lambda$ we have $\mathbf{c}\{\alpha^*, \beta^*\} > \gamma_{\varepsilon^*}$, hence $\mathbf{c}'\{\alpha^*, \beta^*\} > \varepsilon^*$. Without loss of generality for all α 's the truth value of $\zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \alpha^*, \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} > \alpha^*, \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} < \beta^*, \zeta_{\alpha, \ell} > \beta^*$ are

the same. Now apply the “old clause (c)” to $w'_\alpha = w_\alpha \cup \{\alpha^*, \beta^*\}$ and we can find $\alpha \neq \beta, i, j, a$ there. Now $\alpha, \beta, i' = \text{Min}\{\varepsilon : j < \gamma_\varepsilon\}, j' = i' + 1$ are as required.

4) Trivial. $\square_{1.9}$

1.10 Definition. 1) $Qr_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$ means:

- (*) if $f : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\theta) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ satisfies
 $\alpha < \beta < \gamma \Rightarrow \emptyset \neq f\{\alpha, \beta\} \cap f\{\beta, \gamma\} \subseteq f\{\alpha, \gamma\}$, and
 $a \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ then for some $X \in [\lambda]^\mu$ we have
 $\bigcap_{\alpha \neq \beta \in X} f\{\alpha, \beta\} \not\subseteq a$.

2) $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ where $\lambda \geq \mu$ are (infinite) cardinals and A is a Boolean algebra and I is an ideal of A means that there is a function $f : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(I) =: \{J \subseteq I : J \text{ is non-empty closed upward and closed under intersection but } 0_A \notin I\}$ such that

- (a) if $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$, then $f\{\alpha, \gamma\} \supseteq f\{\alpha, \beta\} \cap f\{\beta, \gamma\}$
(b) for some $a^* \in I$ for no $X \in [\lambda]^\mu$ and $b \in I$ do we have $a < b$ and:

$$\alpha \neq \beta \in X \Rightarrow b \in f(\{\alpha, \beta\}).$$

We say in this case “ f witnesses $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ ”.

3) $NQs_2^+(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ means that some $f : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow I$ witnesses it which means that $f' : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(I)$ which is defined by $f'\{\alpha, \beta\} =: \{b \in I : f\{\alpha, \beta\} \leq b\}$ witnesses $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$.

4) $NQs_2^*(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ means $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ is witnessed by some f which satisfies

- (c) if $n < \omega, \zeta_{\alpha,0} < \dots < \zeta_{\alpha,n-1}$ for $\alpha < \mu$ and $a \in I$, then for some $\alpha < \beta$ and b we have: $a < b \in I$ we have:
- (i) $\zeta_{\alpha,\ell} \leq \zeta_{\beta,\ell}$ and $\zeta_{\alpha,\ell} = \zeta_{\beta,m} \rightarrow \ell = m$
(ii) if $\ell < m < n$ then
 $b \in f\{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}, \zeta_{\alpha,m}\} = f\{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}, \zeta_{\beta,m}\}$
(iii) if $\ell, m < n$ then
 $b \in f\{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}, \zeta_{\beta,m}\} = f(\zeta_{\beta,\ell}, \zeta_{\beta,m})$ or b does not belong to
 $f\{\zeta_{\alpha,\ell}, \zeta_{\beta,m}\} \cup f\{\zeta_{\beta,\ell}, \zeta_{\alpha,m}\}$.

5) In part (1) addition of the letter N (that is $NQr_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$) means the negation; similarly in parts (2), (3) omitting N means the negation. We can replace μ by D , a filter on λ meaning replacing “there is $X \in [\lambda]^\mu$ such that ...” by “ $\{\text{otp} X; X \subseteq \mu \text{ is such that } \dots\} \in D$ ”.

6) If we omit A we mean I is a Boolean ring, A the Boolean Algebra it generates. If we omit A and I and write θ we mean in the N -version, “for some $A, I, |A| \leq \theta$ ” (so without N for every such A, I).

Among obvious implications are

1.11 Claim. 1) $NQr_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$ implies $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{P}(\theta), [\theta]^{<\aleph_0})$.
 2) $NQs_2^+(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ implies $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$.
 3) If $\lambda = \mu$ is weakly compact $> \theta$ then $Qr_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$.

1.12 Claim. Assume $cf(\lambda) > 2^\theta$ and $Qr_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$ or just $Qs_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$.

1) If A, B_1, B_2 are Boolean Algebras, $A \subseteq B_1, A \subseteq B_2, |A| \leq \theta$ and

$$Depth^+(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) > \lambda \text{ then } \bigvee_{t=1}^2 Depth^+(B_t) > \mu.$$

2) Similarly for length.

Proof. We start as in the proof of 1.8(1), getting I^*, I, I_1, I_2 and find $t \in \{1, 2\}$ and $b_\alpha \in B_t$ such that:

- (*)₁ $\langle b_\alpha/I_t : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is strictly increasing in B_t/I_t
- (*)₂ I^* is an ideal of A (in fact, a maximal one), and I_t is the ideal of B_t which I^* generates.

Let $f : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow I^*$ be defined as follows: for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ we let $f\{\alpha, \beta\} = \{d \in I^* : b_\alpha - d < b_\beta - d\}$. So $f\{\alpha, \beta\}$ is a non-empty subset of I^* , upward closed and closed under intersection (remember $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow b_\alpha/I^* < b_\beta/I^*$). Now the assumption of (*) of Definition 1.10 holds as $d \in f\{\alpha, \beta\} \cap f\{\beta, \gamma\}, \alpha < \beta < \gamma$ implies $B_t \models b_\alpha - d < b_\beta - d < b_\gamma - d$ so $B_t \models b_\alpha - d < b_\gamma - d$ hence $d \in f\{\alpha, \gamma\}$, thus proving the $\subseteq$. As for the $\supseteq$, if $d_1 \in f\{\alpha, \beta\}, d_2 \in f\{\beta, \gamma\}$ then $d_1 \cup d_2 \in I^*$ belongs to $f\{\alpha, \gamma\}$ (note then $b_\alpha/I^* < b_\gamma/I^*$ so the strict inequality is not a problem).

2) Similar only now $\{b_\alpha/I_t : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is a chain with no repetitions. $\square_{1.12}$

1.13 Claim. If $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu]_{2^\theta, < \aleph_0}^2$ then $Qs_2(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$.

Proof. Straight.

Remark. So we have consistency results by [Sh 276], [Sh 546] in fact by the proofs 2^θ can be reduced to θ .

1.14 Claim. 1) Assume $\theta = cf(\theta) < \chi = \chi^{<\chi} < \lambda, \lambda$ measurable, then in $V_1 = V^{\text{Levy}(\chi, < \lambda)}$ we have $\neg \boxtimes_{\lambda, \lambda, \theta}$, moreover $Qr_2(\lambda, \lambda, \mu)$.

2) If in $V_1, \lambda = \chi^+, \chi > \theta$ and

- (*) D is a normal filter on λ for which in the game $\mathfrak{D} = \mathfrak{D}(\lambda, D, \theta)$ of length $\theta+1$ between the even and odd players choosing $A_i \in D^+$ for $i \leq \theta$ decreasing (of course, for i even, the even player chooses A_i , for i odd, the odd player chooses A_i), the even player can guarantee that for limit $\delta \leq \theta, \bigcap_{i < \delta} A_i \in D^+$.

Then V_2 satisfies the conclusion in part (1).

Proof. 1) By part (2) by [JMMP] (see on the subject [Sh:b] or [Sh:f]).

2) Let $\mathbf{c} : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \theta$ exemplifies $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \lambda, \theta}$. Let St be a winning strategy of even. We chose by induction on $i < \theta, A_i, B_i$ such that

- (a) $\langle A_j : j \leq i \rangle$ is a play of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda, D, \theta)$ in which even use his winning strategy St
- (b) $\langle B_j : j \leq i \rangle$ is a play of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda, D, \theta)$ in which even use his winning strategy St
- (c) for i odd for some $\gamma_i < \lambda$ and $j_i \in (i, \theta)$ we have

$$\gamma_i < \text{Min } A_i$$

$$\gamma_i < \text{Min } B_i$$

$$(\forall \alpha \in A_i)[\mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\} < j_i]$$

$$(\forall \beta \in B_i)[\mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \beta\} \geq j_i]$$

For i even we have no free choice.

For i odd we ask

- (*) is there $\gamma < \lambda$ such that
 $j < \theta \Rightarrow B_{i,j} = \{\beta \in B_{i-1} : \beta > \gamma \text{ and } \mathbf{c}\{\gamma, \beta\} \geq j\} \in D^+?$

If yes, choose such $\gamma = \gamma_i$, so $A_{i-1} \setminus (\gamma_i + 1) = \bigcup_{j < t} \{\alpha \in A_{i-1} : \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\} = j\}$. Hence for some j

$$\{\alpha : \alpha \in A_{i-1}, \alpha > \gamma_i, \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\} < j\} \in D^+.$$

Choose this set as A_i and $B_{i,j}$ as B_i .

If no, let for $\gamma < \lambda, j(\gamma) < \theta$ be a counterexample. So by the normality of the filter $B' =: \{\beta \in B_{i-1} : \text{for every } \gamma < \beta \text{ we have } \mathbf{c}\{\gamma, \beta\} < j(\gamma)\} = \emptyset \text{ mod } D$, so $B_{i-1} \setminus B' \in D^+$ hence for some $j^* < \theta$ we have $B^* = \{\gamma \in B_{i-1} : \gamma \notin B' \text{ and } j(\gamma) = j^*\} \in D^+$.

So $B^* \in D^+$ and for $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ in B^* , $\mathbf{c}\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} < j(\gamma_1) = j^*$.

This contradicts the choice of $\mathbf{c}$.

So we succeed to choose $\langle A_i : i \leq \theta \rangle, \langle B_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$, so we can find $\alpha \in A_\theta$ and $\beta \in B_\theta \setminus (\alpha + 1)$ (as $A_\theta, B_\theta \in D^+$).

So for each $i < \theta$

$$(*)_i \quad \gamma_i < \alpha < \beta, \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\} < j_i, \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \beta\} \geq j_i \text{ so } \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\} < \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \beta\}.$$

But $\mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \beta\} \leq \text{Max}\{\mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \alpha\}, \mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\}\}$. Hence $\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\} \geq \mathbf{c}\{\gamma_i, \beta\}$ but the latter is $\geq j_i$ and $j_i \geq i$, so $\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\} \geq i$. As this holds for any $i < \theta$ we have gotten a contradiction.

1.15 Remark. 1) We can weaken the demand on the even player in the game $\mathcal{D}(\lambda, D, \theta)$ for $\delta = \theta$ to the demand $\bigcap_{i < \delta} A_i \neq \emptyset$ is enough, as we can:

- (α) make $A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$
- (β) if $i = 4j + 1$ retain demand (c) in the proof but if $i = 4j + 3$ uses a similar demand interchanging A_i and B_i .

2) Moreover, instead “even has a winning strategy” it is enough, that “odd has no winning strategy for winning at least one of two plays, played simultaneously”.
Now we can deal with other variants.

We may wonder what is required from A .

1.16 Claim. Assume $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \mu, \theta}$ and A is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality $< cf(\mu)$ (for simplicity) and

- (*) there are $a_i^t \in A$ for $i < \theta, t \in \{1, 2\}$ such that:
 - (i) $i < j < \theta \Rightarrow A \models a_i^t \leq a_j^t$
 - (ii) $a_i^1 \cap a_i^2 = 0$ for $i < \theta$
 - (iii) for every $b \in A, t \in \{1, 2\}$ there is $i_t(b) < \theta$ such that:
if D is an ultrafilter on A such that $b \in D, a_i^{3-t} \notin D$ for $i < \theta$ and
 $j \in [i_t(b), \theta)$ and $\bigwedge_{i < j} a_i^t \notin D$, then there is an ultrafilter D' on A such
that $a_j^t \in D', b \in D'$ and $\bigwedge_{i < j} a_i^t \notin D'$.

Then $(\lambda, \mu) \in SpDpFP(A)$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of 1.5, only now fixing τ_α we also fix the parameters from A , say $b_i, \dots, b_{k^*}$ and choose $i(*) < \theta$ above $\sup\{j_t(b) : t \in \{1, 2\}\}$ and $b \in \langle b_1, \dots, b_{k^*} \rangle_A$. $\square_{1.16}$

1.17 Claim. Assume

- (a) A is a Boolean Algebra and I_1, I_2 are ideal of A and $I_1 \cap I_2 = \{0\}$
- (b) for $\ell = 1, 2$ we have $NQs_2^*(\lambda, \mu, A, I_\ell)$ and $|A| < cf(\mu)$
- (c) $I_1 \cup I_2$ generates A (or less).

Then there are Boolean Algebras B_1, B_2 extending A such that $Depth^+(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) = \lambda^+, Depth^+(B_1) \leq \mu, Depth^+(B_2) \leq \mu$.

Remark. We can weaken clause (c). We may wonder on using more ideals.

Proof. Like 1.5.

Note

1.18 Claim. 1) Assume

- (a) $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \mu$, and
- (b) μ is strong limit singular, $\text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa < \theta$
- (c) for any $\mathbf{c} : [\theta]^2 \rightarrow \kappa$ satisfying $\alpha < \beta < \gamma \Rightarrow \mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \gamma\} \subseteq \text{Max}\{\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\}, \mathbf{c}\{\beta, \gamma\}\}$,
there is $X \in [\theta]^\theta$ such that $\text{Rang}(\mathbf{c} \upharpoonright [X]^2)$ is a bounded subset of κ .

then $\{\delta < \mu^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta\} \in I[\lambda]$.

2) We can replace (b) by

$$(b)^- \quad \mu > \theta > \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu), (\forall \sigma < \mu)[\sigma^{<\theta} < \mu].$$

Proof. See [Sh 108], [Sh 88a].

Toward solving problem 11 of [M] we may consider:

1.19 Definition. 1) $NQt(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ means:

- (a) A is a Boolean Algebra
- (b) I is an ideal of A
- (c) $\lambda \geq \mu \geq \aleph_0$
- (d) there is a witness $(\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c})$ which means
 - (α) $\mathbf{c}_\ell : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{J}[I]$ (see 1.10(2))
 - (β) $(\mathbf{c}_1\{\alpha, \beta\}) \cap (\mathbf{c}_2\{\alpha, \beta\}) = 0_A$
 - (γ) if $\alpha < \beta < \gamma < \lambda$ then $(\mathbf{c}_\ell\{\alpha, \beta\}) \cap (\mathbf{c}_\ell\{\beta, \gamma\}) \subseteq \mathbf{c}_\ell\{\alpha, \gamma\}$
 - (δ) for no $X \in [\lambda]^\mu$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\alpha \in I \setminus \{0\}$ do we have:
 - (*) for $\alpha < \beta$ in X we have $d \in \mathbf{c}_\ell\{\alpha, \beta\}$.

2) $NQt(\lambda, \mu, \theta)$ means $NQt(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ for some A, I such that $|A| \leq \theta$.

1.20 Fact: 1) If $NQt(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ and $\lambda \geq \mu \geq \text{cf}(\mu) > \theta$, then the conclusion of 1.5 holds for the Boolean Algebra A .

2) Assume $\lambda \geq \mu$, $\text{cf}(\lambda) > 2^{|A|}$ and $A \subseteq B_t$ (for $t = 1, 2$), $\text{Depth}^+(B_t) \leq \mu$ and $\text{Depth}^+(B_1 \oplus_A B_2) > \lambda$. Then $NQt(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ for some maximal ideal I of A .

Proof. Like the earlier ones.

§2 ON THE FAMILY OF HOMOMORPHIC IMAGES OF A BOOLEAN ALGEBRA

Our best result is 2.6(2) but we first deal with more specific cases.

2.1 Lemma. *Assume $\kappa < \mu < \lambda$ and λ is a strong limit singular of cofinality κ and $\text{cf}(\mu) = \kappa$.*

Then every Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ has a homomorphic image of cardinality $\in [\mu, 2^{<\mu}]$ or $= \mu^{\aleph_0}$.

First we prove

2.2 Claim. *Assume $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu < 2^{<\mu}$. Any Boolean Algebra B of cardinality $\geq \chi =: \sum_{\theta < \mu} (2^\theta)^+$ has a homomorphic image of cardinality $\in [\mu, \chi]$; note that $(2^{<\mu})^+ \geq \chi$.*

Proof. Let $\mu = \sum_{i < \kappa} \mu_i$ such that $i < j \Rightarrow \mu_i < \mu_j$ and moreover $i < j \Rightarrow \mu < 2^{\mu_i} \leq 2^{\mu_j} \leq 2^{<\mu}$ and $\mu_i > \kappa$ and if $\langle 2^{\mu_i} : i < \kappa \rangle$ is not eventually constant it is strictly increasing.

If B has an independent subset of cardinality μ , then it has a homomorphic image of cardinality $\in [\mu, \mu^{\aleph_0}]$ but $\mu^{\aleph_0} < \chi$ so without loss of generality there is no independent $X \subseteq B$ of cardinality μ hence for no $\theta < \mu$ does B satisfy the θ^+ -c.c., hence $c(B) > \theta$. So $c(B) \geq \mu$ which is singular hence by a theorem of Erdős and Tarski, B has an antichain $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$. For each $i < \mu$, let B_i be the subalgebra of B generated by $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_i\}$ let B_i^c be the completion of B_i . So id_{B_i} is a homomorphism from B_i into B_i^c hence it can be extended to a homomorphism f_i from B into B_i^c .

Clearly $B_i \subseteq \text{Rang}(f_i) \subseteq B_i^c$ so $\mu_i \leq (\text{Rang}(f_i)) \leq |B_i^c| \leq 2^{\mu_i}$.

If for some i , $|\text{Rang}(f_i)| \geq \mu$ we are done: $B'_i =: \text{Rang}(f_i)$ is a homomorphic image of B , $\mu \leq |B'_i| \leq |B_i^c| \leq 2^{\mu_i} < \chi$. Otherwise, we have $i < \kappa \Rightarrow |B'_i| < \mu$, let $B^* = \prod_{i < \kappa} B'_i$, and we define a homomorphism f from B into B^* , $f(x) = \langle f_i(x) : i < \kappa \rangle$.

Clearly B^* is a Boolean Algebra and f a homomorphism from B into B^* . Now let $B' = \text{Rang}(f)$, clearly B' is a homomorphic image of B and

$|B'| = |\text{Rang}(f)| \leq |B^*| \leq \prod_{i < \kappa} |B'_i| \leq \prod_{i < \kappa} \mu = \mu^\kappa \leq 2^{\mu_0} < \chi$. On the other hand f is

one to one on each B_i (as f_i is) hence is one to one on $\bigcup_{i < \kappa} B_i$ which has cardinality

μ , so $|B'| \geq \mu$.

So we are done. □_{2.2}

2.3 Remark. If μ is regular, $|B| \geq \mu$, then B has a homomorphic image of cardinality $\in [\mu, 2^{<\mu}]$, this follows by Juhász¹ [Ju1].

¹on cardinality and weight of subspace of compact spaces

2.4 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ we have $\langle B_i^\ell : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of Boolean Algebras and for simplicity B_0^ℓ is trivial
- (b) $B_i^2 \subseteq B_i^3$ and $B_i^0 \subseteq B_i^1$ for $i \leq \delta$
- (c) for $i < \delta$ non-limit, B_δ^1 is complete
- (d) h_i is a homomorphism from B_i^2 into B_i^0 , increasing with i
- (e) if $x \in B_{i+1}^2, y \in B_i^3$ and $B_{i+1}^3 \models "x \cap z = 0"$, then for some $z \in B_i^2$ we have $B_i^3 \models z \cap y = 0, B_{i+1}^2 \models x \leq z$.

Then we can find a homomorphism h from B_δ^2 into B_δ^1 extending h_δ .

Proof. We choose by induction on i a homomorphism f_i from B_i^3 into B_i^1 extending h_i .

For $i = 0$: Trivial as the B_i^ℓ are trivial.

For i limit: Let $f_i = \bigcup_{j < i} f_j$.

For $i = j + 1$: Let $H_i = \{f : f \text{ a homomorphism from some subalgebra } B_f \text{ of } B_{i+1}^3 \text{ into } B_{i+1}^1 \text{ extending } f_j \text{ and } h_i\}$. As B_{i+1}^1 is complete, it is enough to prove that $H_i \neq \emptyset$. Let B'_{i+1} be the subalgebra of B_{i+1}^3 , generated by $B_{i+1}^2 \cup B_i^3$, so it is enough to prove that $f_i \cup h_{i+1}$, induce a homomorphism from B'_{i+1} into B_{i+1}^1 . Easily it suffices to prove:

- (*) if $x \in B_{i+1}^2, y \in B_i^3$ are disjoint (in B_{i+1}^3), then $h_{i+1}(x), f_i(y)$ are disjoint (in B_{i+1}^1).

By the assumption (e) there is $z \in B_i^2$ such that $B_{i+1}^2 \models x \leq z, B_i^3 \models x \cap z = 0$ hence $B_{i+1}^0 \models h_{i+1}(x) \leq h_{i+1}(z)$ and $B_i^1 \models f_i(x) \cap f_i(z) = 0$. As $f_i(z) = h_i(z) = h_{i+1}(z)$ we are done. $\square_{2.4}$

Proof of 2.1. So by 2.2 without loss of generality μ is strong limit (as $\mu = 2^{<\mu}$ & μ not strong limit $\Rightarrow \mu = \text{cf}(\mu)$), so let $\mu = \sum_{i < \kappa} \mu_i, \kappa < \mu_i$ and $\prod_{i < j} 2^{\mu_i^+} < \mu_j$. Similarly,

let $\lambda = \sum_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i, i < j \Rightarrow \lambda_i < \lambda_j$, moreover, $\lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) > \prod_{j < i} 2^{\lambda_j}$. As in the proof of 2.2, it suffices to deal with the following three cases.

Case A: There is an antichain $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ of B . As we can replace B by any homomorphic image of cardinality $\geq \lambda$ without loss of generality $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is a maximal antichain of B and each a_α an atom. So without loss of generality B is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ and $a_\alpha = \{\alpha\}$. Let $B = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} B_i, B_i$ increasing continuous,

$$|B_i| \leq \sum_{j < i} \lambda_j.$$

We can find $X_i \subseteq \lambda_i$ of cardinality λ_i such that:

- (*)_i for each $a \in B_i$ either $(\forall \alpha \in X_i)(a_\alpha \leq b)$ or $(\forall \alpha \in X_i)(a_\alpha \cap b = 0)$
- (*) $\{a_\alpha : \alpha \in X_i\} \subseteq B_{j_i}$ where $i < j_i < \kappa$.

Choose $Y_i \subseteq X_i$ of cardinality μ_i .

Let $Y = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} Y_i$ and let $f : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$ be the following homomorphism:

$f(a) = a \cap Y$ and let B' be $\text{Rang}(f)$, so $B' \subseteq \mathcal{P}(Y)$ is a homomorphic image of B and

$$|B'| \geq |\{a_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}| = |Y| = \sum_{i < \kappa} |Y_i| = \sum_{i < \kappa} \mu_i = \mu$$

$$\begin{aligned} |B'| &\leq |\{a \cap Y : a \in B\}| \leq \sum_{i < \kappa} |\{a \cap Y : a \in B_i\}| \\ &= \sum_{i < \kappa} |\{a : a \subseteq Y \text{ and } (\forall j)(i \leq j < \kappa) a \cap Y_j \in \{\emptyset, Y_j\}\}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i < \kappa} (2^\kappa \times 2^{\mu_i}) = \sum_{i < \kappa} 2^{\mu_i} = 2^{<\mu} = \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Case B: B satisfies the θ -c.c., $\theta < \lambda, \kappa > \aleph_0$. Then B has an independent subset of cardinality χ for each $\chi < \lambda$, in particular $\chi = \mu$, say $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$. Let B'_0 be the subalgebra of B which $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$ generates, and B_0^c is completion, so id_{B_0} can be extended to a homomorphism f from B into B_0^c , let $B_1 = \text{Rang}(f)$ so $\mu = |B_0| \leq |B_1| \leq |B_0^c| \leq \mu^{\aleph_0} = \mu$ so B_1 is as required.

Case C: B satisfies the θ -c.c., $\theta < \lambda, \kappa = \aleph_0$.

Let $\lambda = \sum_{n < \omega} \lambda_n, \theta < \lambda_n, 2^{\lambda_n} < \lambda_{n+1}, \lambda_n = \text{cf}(\lambda_n), \lambda_n^\theta = \lambda_n$. Trivially we can find pairwise disjoint $\langle b_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $|B \restriction b_n| \geq \lambda_n^+$ (why? choose by induction on n, B_n such that $\ell < n \Rightarrow b_\ell \cap b_n = 0, (B \restriction b_n) \geq \lambda_n^+$ and $|B \restriction (1_B - \bigcup_{\ell \leq n} b_\ell)| = \lambda$);

if we are stuck in n , then $I =: \{x \in B : x \cap \bigcup_{f < n} b_\ell = 0 \text{ and } |B \restriction x| \leq \lambda_n\}$ has cardinality and we get a contradiction.

We can find for each $n, \langle a_\alpha^n : \alpha < \lambda_n^+ \rangle$ such that $a_\alpha^n \leq b_n$ and $\langle a_\alpha^n : \alpha < \lambda_n^+ \rangle$ is independent in $B \restriction b_n$. So some homomorphic image of B has λ atoms and we get Case A. Alternatively, let $B = \bigcup_{n < \omega} B_n, B_n$ a subalgebra of B of cardinality λ_n and

$B_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ and $\{b_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq B_0, a_\alpha^n \in B_n$ for $\alpha < \lambda_n^+$ pairwise distinct. We can find $X_n \subseteq \lambda_n^+$ of cardinality λ_n^+ such that $\langle a_\alpha^n : \alpha \in X_n^+ \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence over B_n ([Sh:92]), even more specifically for some $B'_n, B_n \subseteq B'_n \subseteq B_{n+1}, |B'_n| = \lambda_n$, and some disjoint ideals I_n, J_n of B'_n , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_1 \quad &x \in I_n \ \& \ y \in J_n \ \& \ \alpha \in X_n \Rightarrow x \cap a_\alpha^n = x \ \& \ y \cap a_\alpha^n = 0 \\ (*)_2 \quad &x \in B'_n \setminus I_n \setminus J_n \ \& \ \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n \in X_n \ \& \ \bigwedge_{\ell=1}^n b_i \in \{a_{\alpha_\ell}^n, -a_{\alpha_\ell}^n\} \Rightarrow \\ &\bigcap_{\ell=1}^n b_\ell \cap x \neq 0 \ \& \ (\bigcap_{\ell=1}^m b_i) - x \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let A be the subalgebra of B generated by $\{b_n : n < \omega\} \cup \{a_\alpha^n : \alpha \in X_n\}$ and A^c , its completion and $A^* =: \{c \in A^c : \text{for every } n \text{ large enough, } c \cap b_n \in \{b_n, 0\}\}$.

Clearly $\{b_n : n < \omega\}$ is a maximal antichain of A hence of A^c and of A^* and B_n is a free Boolean Algebra generated by λ_n^+ elements hence $|A^c \restriction b_n| = (\lambda_n^+)^{\aleph_0}$ hence

$$|A^*| = 2^{\aleph_0} \times \left(\sum_{n < \omega} \lambda_n^{\aleph_0} \right) = \sum_{\chi < \mu} \chi^{\aleph_0}.$$

Let D_n be an ultrafilter on $B_n \restriction b_n$ such that $D_n \cap (I_n \cup J_n) = \emptyset$. Let h_n be a homomorphism from $B_n \restriction b_n$ into $A^c \restriction b_n$ such that $\bigwedge_{\alpha \in X_n} h_n(a_\alpha^n) = a_\alpha^n$,

$x \in D_n \Rightarrow h_n(x) = b_n = 1_{A^c \restriction b_n}$ and $x \in B_n \setminus D_n \Rightarrow h_n(x) = 0$. Possible by the choice of X_n . Now we define $h : B \rightarrow A^c$ by $h(x) = \sum h_n(x \cap b_n)$.

Clearly $x \in B_n \Rightarrow h_n(x \cap b_n) \in \{0, b_n\}$ hence $\text{Rang}(h) \subseteq A^*$. So h is a homomorphism f from B into A^* such that $f(b_n) = b_n$ and $\alpha \in X_n \Rightarrow f(a_\alpha^n) = a_\alpha^n$.

Hence $\mu = |A| \leq |\text{Rang}(f)| \leq |A^*| = \sum_{\chi < \mu} \chi^{\aleph_0}$ and we are done. $\square_{2.1}$

2.5 Observation. If μ is strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0$ and $\mu \leq \lambda < 2^\mu$, B a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ , then $\text{ult}(B) > \lambda \Rightarrow \text{ult}(B) \geq 2^\mu$.

Proof. Straight, or by [Sh 454a] (for even a more general setting: a topology).

We can add

2.6 Claim. 1) If λ is a strong limit singular and B a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ , then for some homomorphic image B' of B we have $|B'| = |\text{Ult}(B')| = \lambda$.
2) If $\lambda_i \geq \mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \text{cf}(\lambda)$, then for some homomorphic image B' of B we have:

$$\mu \leq |B'| \leq 2^{<\mu}, \mu \leq |\text{Ult}(B')| \leq \sum_{\theta < \mu} 2^{2^\theta}$$

(remember: the free Boolean Algebra generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$, B_λ (or its completion) has a homomorphic image any Boolean Algebra (any σ -complete Boolean Algebra) of cardinality $\leq \lambda$.)

Proof. 1) Without loss of generality B is a Boolean Algebra of subsets of λ and let $\lambda = \sum_{i < \theta} \mu_\zeta$, $\theta = \text{cf}(\lambda)$, $\mu_\zeta > \theta + \prod_{\xi < \zeta} 2^{\mu_\xi}$ and let $B = \bigcup_{i < \theta} B_i$, B_i increasing continuously $|B_\zeta| \leq \sum_{\xi < \zeta} \mu_\xi^+$. We know that there are $(a_i^\zeta, \alpha_i^\zeta)$ for $i < \mu_\zeta^+$ such that

$a_i^\zeta \in B$, $\alpha_i^\zeta < \lambda$, $\alpha_j^\zeta \in a_i^\zeta \Leftrightarrow j = i$ (e.g. by the well known $s(B) \geq \ell g_2(B)$). So without loss of generality $\alpha_i^\zeta < \mu_\zeta^+$, $a_i^\zeta \in B_{\zeta+1}$. As we can replace B by a homomorphic image without loss of generality $\alpha_i^\zeta = \mu_\zeta + i$. We can find $X_\zeta \in [\{\alpha : \mu_\zeta \leq \alpha < \mu_\zeta^+\}]^{\mu_\zeta^+}$ for $\zeta < \theta$ such that

$(\forall a \in B_\zeta)(\forall \alpha \in X_i)(\alpha \in a) \vee (\forall \alpha \in X_i)(\alpha \notin a)$ (like case A of the proof of 2.1, so actually there it suffices. Let $X = \bigcup_{\zeta < \theta} X_\zeta$ and let $Y_\zeta = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} X_\varepsilon$.

Now $X = \bigcup_{i < \theta} X_i$, $h : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ is $h(a) = a \cap X$. Easily $B' =: h(B)$ is as required.

Let $B'' = \{a \in B' : \text{for every } i < \theta, X_i \subseteq a \text{ or } X_i \cap a = \emptyset\}$.

Let B^+ be the Boolean Algebra of subsets of X generated by $B'' \cup B'$. Now clearly

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Ult}(B')| &\leq |\text{Ult}(B^+)| \\ &\leq |\{p \in \text{Ult}(B'') : \text{for every } i < \theta, \text{ we have } Y_i \notin p\}| + \sum_{i < \theta} |\text{Ult}(B'' \upharpoonright Y_i)| \\ &\leq 2^{2^\theta} + \sum_{i < \theta} 2^{2^{|Y_i|}} \leq \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

2) Easy (by parts (1), 2.7 below and earlier proofs). $\square_{2.6}$

2.7 Observation: 1) Let B_σ be the Boolean Algebra generated freely by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \sigma\}$ and B_σ^c its completion. Then there is a homomorphic image B'_σ of B_σ^c say by $f, [\sigma]^{<\aleph_0} \subseteq f(B_\sigma) \subseteq B'_\sigma \subseteq B_\sigma^* = \{X \subseteq \sigma : |X| \leq \aleph_0 \text{ or } |\sigma \setminus X| \leq \aleph_0\}$ so B'_σ has $\leq \sigma^{\aleph_0}$ elements and $\leq \sigma^{+\aleph_2}$ ultrafilters and $\geq \sigma$ elements.

2) We can make above use $B_{\sigma^{\aleph_0}}^*$ and get $|B'_\sigma| = \sigma^{\aleph_0}$.

Proof. 1) Let the homomorphism $f_0 : B \rightarrow B_\sigma^*$ be induced by $f_0(x_\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$.

Let for $\alpha < \sigma$, $B_{\sigma, \alpha}^c$ be the complete subalgebra of B_σ^c which $\{x_\beta : \beta < \lambda \text{ and } \beta \neq \alpha\}$ generated, so $(\forall b)(b \in B_{\sigma, \alpha}^c \ \& \ 0 < b < 1 \rightarrow c \cap a_\alpha > 0 \ \& \ c - a_\alpha > 0)$. Let D be an ultrafilter on B_σ^c such that $\{-x_\alpha : \alpha < \sigma\} \subseteq D$ and for $\alpha < \sigma$ let D_α be an ultrafilter on B_σ^c such that: $D_\alpha \cap B_{\sigma, \alpha}^c = D \cap B_{\sigma, \alpha}^c$ and $a_\alpha \in D_\alpha$. We define a homomorphism $f : B_\sigma^c \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ and $f(b) = \{\alpha < \sigma : b \in D_\alpha\}$. Clearly f is a homomorphism from B_σ^c into B'_σ and if $c \in B_\sigma^c$ for some $\alpha_n < \sigma$ (for $n < \omega$) and (infinite) Boolean term $\tau, b = \tau(\dots, x_{\alpha_n}, \dots)_{n < \omega}$, so $\alpha \in \sigma \setminus \{\alpha_n : n < \omega\} \Rightarrow [\alpha \in f(b) \leftrightarrow b \in D_\alpha \leftrightarrow b \in D]$, so $f(b)$ contains $\sigma \setminus \{\alpha_n : n < \omega\}$ or is disjoint to it hence $f(b) \in B'_\sigma$, so we are done.

2) Let $\{Y_\gamma : \gamma < \sigma^{\aleph_0}\} \subseteq [\sigma]^{\aleph_0}$ be such that $\gamma < \beta \Rightarrow Y_\gamma \cap Y_\beta$ finite (clearly possible) let $Y_\gamma = \{\alpha_{\gamma, \ell} : \ell < \omega\}$ with no repetitions; moreover, without loss of generality

$$\alpha_{\gamma_1, \ell_2} = \alpha_{\gamma_2, \ell_2} \Rightarrow \ell_1 = \ell_2 \ \& \ \bigwedge_{\ell < \ell_1} \alpha_{\gamma_1, \ell} = \alpha_{\gamma_2, \ell}.$$

Let $y_{\gamma, m} = \bigcup_{k < m} (x_{\alpha_{\gamma, 3k}} - \bigcup_{\ell < 3k} x_{\alpha_{\gamma, \ell}}) \in B_\sigma, y_\gamma = \bigcup_m y_{\gamma, m} \in B_\sigma^c$. Let A be the subalgebra of B_σ^c which $\{y_\gamma : \gamma < \sigma^{\aleph_0}\}$ generates and $f_0 : A \rightarrow B_{(\sigma^{\aleph_0})}^*$ be the homomorphism induced by $f_0(y_\gamma) = \{\gamma\}$, and continue as above. $\square_{2.7}$

§3 IF $d(B)$ IS SMALL, THEN DEPTH OR IND ARE NOT TINY

3.1 Definition. 1) We say $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$ is semi-independent if: it is a sequence of distinct elements in a Boolean Algebra B and for some ideal I on B for any $\alpha < \gamma < \beta^*$ and $b \in \langle a_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle_B$ we have

- (*)₁ $b \in I \Rightarrow b \cap a_\gamma = b \cap a_\alpha$
- (*)₂ $b \notin I \Rightarrow \{b \cap a_\alpha, b \cap a_\gamma\}$ is an independent set in $B \upharpoonright b$, (so e.g. $b \cap a_\alpha > 0$)
- (*)₃ $b \notin I, b \cap a_\alpha \in I \Rightarrow b \cap a_\gamma \in I$
- (*)₄ $b \notin I, b - a_\alpha \in I \Rightarrow b - a_\gamma \in I$.

2) $si^+(B) = \text{Min}\{\lambda : \text{there is no } \langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle \text{ in } B \text{ which is semi-independent}\}$ and we say $\bar{a} = \langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ and I witness $\lambda < si^+(B)$. Let $si(B) = \sup\{\lambda : \text{there is a semi-independent sequence } \langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle \text{ in } B\}$.

3) $si^{1+}(B)$ is defined similarly to $si^+(B)$ with $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda + 1 \rangle$. We say I , $\langle a_\beta : \beta \leq \lambda \rangle$ witness $\lambda < si^{1+}(B)$.

3.2 Fact. 0) $si(B), si^{1+}(B) \leq si^+(B) \leq (si(B))^+$.

1) $\text{ind}^+(B) \leq si^+(B)$.

2) $si^+(B) \geq t^+(B)$.

3) $si^+(B) \leq \text{ind}^+(B) + \text{Depth}^+(B)$.

Proof. 0) Read the definition.

1) $\text{ind}^+(B) \leq si^+(B)$ holds as independent implies semi-independent for the ideal $\{O_B\}$.

2) Let $\lambda < si^+(B)$ and $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle, I$ witness it.

Let D be an ultrafilter on B disjoint to I . As we can replace $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ by $\langle a'_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ when $a'_\beta \in \{a_\beta, -a_\beta\}$, without loss of generality $\bigwedge_{\beta < \lambda} a_\beta \in D$. Let $\beta_0 < \dots < \beta_{m-1} < \beta_m < \dots < \beta_{n-1}$. Let for $k \in [m, n], b_k = \bigcap_{\ell < m} a_{\beta_\ell} \cap \bigcap_{\ell \in [m, k)} (-a_{\beta_\ell})$.

So $b_m \in D$ as $b_{\beta_0}, \dots, b_{\beta_{m-1}} \in D$. So $b_m \notin I$.

We should prove $b_n > 0$.

Let $k \in [m, n]$ be maximal such that $b_k \notin I$.

So k is well defined, if $k = n$ we are done as then $b_n \notin I \Rightarrow b_n > 0$, so we can assume $k < n$. So by the Definition 3.1(1)(*)₂ with $(b_k, \beta_k, \beta_{k+1})$ here standing for (b, α, γ) there we have $b_{k+1} \cap (-a_{\beta_{k+1}}) = b_k \cap (-a_{\beta_k}) \cap (-a_{\beta_{k+1}}) = (b_k \cap (-a_{\beta_k})) \cap (b_k \cap (-a_{\beta_{k+1}}))$ is > 0 and by the maximality of $k, b_{k+1} \in I$, so by 3.1(1)(*)₁ we have $b_{k+1} \cap a_{\beta_{k+1}} = b_{k+1} \cap a_{\beta_{k+2}} = \dots$ hence $b_{k+1} \cap (-a_{\beta_k}) = b_{k+2} = \dots = b_n$ so $b_n \neq 0$.

3) Let $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle, I$ witness $\lambda < si^+(B)$.

If $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ is independent we are done, so assume not, so let $\beta^* < \lambda$ be minimal such that $\langle a_\beta : \beta \leq \beta^* \rangle$ is not independent modulo I ; so $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$ is independent modulo I and for some $b \in \langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle_B$ satisfying $b > 0$, (so $b \notin I$ by the assumption on β^*), we have $b \cap a_{\beta^*} \in I$ or $b - a_{\beta^*} \in I$. Now by symmetry without loss of generality the former holds.

So assume $\beta^* \leq \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \gamma_3 < \lambda$, by $(*)_3$ of 3.1 we have $b \cap a_{\gamma_\ell} \in I$ (for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$) and so by $(*)_1$ of 3.1 we have $b \cap a_{\gamma_1} \cap a_{\gamma_2} = b \cap a_{\gamma_1} \cap a_{\gamma_3}$ but $b \notin I$ hence by $(*)_3$ of 3.1 we have $b - a_{\gamma_3} \notin I$ hence $(b - a_{\gamma_1}) \cap a_{\gamma_2} \neq 0$.

Now $b \cap a_{\gamma_1} \cap a_{\gamma_2} = b \cap a_{\gamma_1} \cap a_{\gamma_2} \cap a_{\gamma_3} \geq b \cap a_{\gamma_2} \cap a_{\gamma_3}$. So $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq \gamma_3 \leq \gamma_4$ implies $b \cap a_{\gamma_1} \cap a_{\gamma_2} \geq b \cap a_{\gamma_3} \cap a_{\gamma_4}$. Let $c_\gamma = b \cap a_{\beta^*+2\gamma} \cap a_{\beta^*+2\gamma+1}$, so $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \lambda \Rightarrow c_{\gamma_1} \geq c_{\gamma_2}$. Can equality hold? Clearly $c_{\gamma_1} \in I$ so $b - c_{\gamma_1} \notin I$ hence by $(*)_2$ of 3.1(1) we have $(b - c_{\gamma_1}) \cap a_{\beta^*+2\gamma_2} \cap a_{\beta^*+2\gamma_2+1} > 0$ so necessarily $(b - c_{\gamma_1}) \cap c_{\gamma_2} > 0$ hence $c_{\gamma_1} \neq c_{\gamma_2}$. Together $c_{\gamma_1} > c_{\gamma_2}$. So $\langle c_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify $\kappa < \text{Depth}^+(B)$. $\square_{3.2}$

3.3 Claim. Assume B is a Boolean Algebra $\kappa \geq \text{ind}^+(B), d(B) \leq \lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa} < |B|$.

1) $\text{Depth}^+(B) > \kappa$.

2) If in addition $\lambda^+ \rightarrow (\mu + 1)_\sigma^3$ for $\sigma < \kappa$, then $\text{Depth}^+(B) > \mu, \text{si}^+(B) > \mu$ [Saharon?]

Proof. 1) Let $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a list of pairwise distinct elements of B . As $\lambda \geq d(B)$ without loss of generality B is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$. Let $B_\alpha = \langle \{a_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \rangle_B$ and

$$E =: \{ \delta < \lambda^+ : B_\delta \cap \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\} = \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \}$$

clearly it is a club of λ^+ .

For every $\delta \in S_0 =: \{ \delta \in E : \text{cf}(\delta) \geq \kappa \}$ we let $I_\delta =: \{ b \in B_\delta : a_\delta \cap b \in B_\delta \}$, so I_δ is an ideal of the subalgebra B_δ of B . Let $\delta \in S_0$, and J be an ideal on B_δ and now we try to choose by induction on $i < \kappa$, an ordinal $\alpha_{\delta, J, i}$ such that:

(a) $\alpha_{\delta, J, j} < \alpha_{\delta, J, i} < \delta$ for $j < i$

(b) $\langle a_{\alpha_{\delta, J, j}} / J : j < i \rangle$ is independent in the Boolean Algebra B_δ / J .

If we succeed, then $\langle a_{\alpha_{\delta, J, i}} : i < \kappa \rangle$ contradict the assumption $\kappa \geq \text{ind}^+(B)$, so for some $i(\delta, J) < \kappa$ we have: $\alpha_{\delta, J, i}$ is defined iff $i < i(\delta, J)$. So for some stationary $S_1 \subseteq S_0$ and $i(*) < \delta$ and $\langle \alpha_i : i < i(*) \rangle$, an increasing sequence of ordinals $< \lambda^+$, we have $S_1 = \{ \delta \in S : i(\delta) = i(*) \text{ and } i < i(*) \Rightarrow \alpha_{\delta, J, i} = \alpha_i \}$.

Let $\langle b_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(*) \rangle$ list the non-zero Boolean combination of $\{a_{\alpha_i} : i < i(*)\}$ so $\gamma(*) < \kappa$. As B is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ we can choose a function H such that $\text{Dom}(H) = B \setminus \{\emptyset\}, H(c) \in c$. Choose a function F_δ , $\text{Dom}(F_\delta) = I_\delta$ and $c \in I_\delta \Rightarrow F_\delta(c) = c \cap a_\delta \in B_\delta$. Again for some $Y \subseteq \gamma(*)$ and $\langle x_\gamma, y_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(*) \rangle$ we have

$$S_2 = \{ \delta \in S_1 : b_\gamma \in I_\delta \Leftrightarrow \gamma \in Y \text{ and for } \gamma \in \gamma(*) \setminus Y, H(b_\gamma \cap a_\delta) = x_\gamma, H(b_\gamma - a_\delta) = y_\gamma \}$$

is a stationary subset of λ^+ .

For each $\delta \in S_2$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\gamma < \gamma(*)$ we try to choose by induction on $i < \kappa$, an ordinal $\beta_{\delta, \gamma, i}$ such that:

(a)' $\delta > \beta_{\delta, \gamma, i} > \beta_{\delta, \gamma, j}$ for $j < i$

- (b)' $\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i} > \alpha_j$ for $j < i(*)$
- (c)' $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \in I_\delta$
(remember $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}$ if $\mathbf{t} = 1$ and is $-a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}$ if $\mathbf{t} = 0$)
- (d)' $B_{\delta,\gamma,i}$ is the smallest subalgebra of B_δ containing $\{b_\gamma\} \cup \{a_{\alpha_j} : j < i(*)\} \cup \{a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}} : j < i\}$
- (e)' if $c \in I_\delta \cap B_{\delta,\gamma,i}$ then $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}} \cap c = F_\delta(c) = a_\delta \cap c$ (in fact just $c \in \{b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} : j < i\}$ suffice)
- (f)' if $c \in B_{\delta,\gamma,i}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \{0,1\}$ then $c \cap a_\delta^{\mathbf{s}} \neq 0 \Rightarrow H(c \cap a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}}) \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{s}}$ (in fact just $c \in \{b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} : j < i\}$ suffice).

Now

- (*) If for some $\delta \in S_2$ and $\gamma \in \gamma(*) \setminus Y$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \{0,1\}$ we succeed, we can prove $\text{Depth}^+(B) > \kappa$.

[Why? We just prove that $\langle a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} : i < \kappa \rangle$ is strictly increasing. Let

$j < i < \kappa$, so by clause (c)' we know that $b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \in I_\delta$ but $b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} \in B_{\delta,\gamma,i}$ by clause (d)' hence $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} = F_\delta(b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}) = a_\delta \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ by clause (e)' and similarly $(-a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}) \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} = (-a_\delta) \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}$.

So in any case $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} = a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}$.

So

$$x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \Leftrightarrow x \in a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}.$$

So if $x \in a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma$ then

$$x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \Leftrightarrow x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}.$$

so

$$x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \Rightarrow x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}.$$

The above statement means

$$x \in a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \Rightarrow [x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \Rightarrow x \in a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}]$$

hence $\langle a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} : i < \kappa \rangle$ is $\leq$ -increasing. But $b_\gamma \notin I_\delta$ hence $a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \notin B_\delta$, hence for $j < i$, $a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \neq a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ (as by clause (c)' we know that $b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \in I_\delta$ so $a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \in B_\delta$).

So $0 < a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma - a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} = (b_\gamma - a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}) \cap a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}}$ hence $x = H((b_\gamma - a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}) \cap a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}}) \in a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}}$ is well defined and belongs to $a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ by clause (f)'. So x belongs to $a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}}, b_\gamma - a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}}, a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ so it exemplifies $a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,j}}^{\mathbf{t}} \neq a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}}$. So $\langle a_\delta^{\mathbf{t}} \cap b_\gamma \cap a_{\beta_{\delta,\gamma,i}}^{\mathbf{t}} : i < \kappa \rangle$ is strictly increasing.]

We have proved $(*)$, so assume toward contradiction that for $\delta \in S_2, \gamma \in \gamma(*) \setminus Y, a_{\beta_{\delta, \gamma, i}}$ is well defined iff $i < j(\delta, \gamma)$ where $j(\delta, \gamma) < \kappa$. So again for some $\beta_{\gamma, i} (\gamma \in \gamma(*) \setminus Y, i < j(\gamma))$ we have

$$S_3 = \left\{ \delta \in S_2 : \text{for every } \gamma \in \gamma^* \setminus Y \text{ we have} \right. \\ \left. \begin{aligned} j(\delta, \gamma) = j(\gamma), i < j(\gamma) &\Rightarrow \beta_{\delta, \gamma, i} = \beta_{\gamma, i} \\ \text{and } i < j(\gamma) &\Rightarrow B_{\delta, \gamma, i} = B_{\gamma, i} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

and is stationary.

Let $\langle b_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(**) \rangle$ list $\langle \{a_{\alpha_i} : i < i(*)\} \cup \{a_{\beta_{\gamma, i}} : \gamma \in \gamma(*) \setminus Y, i < j(\gamma)\} \rangle$, so for some stationary $S_4 \subseteq S_3$ we have: $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in S_4 \Rightarrow H_{\delta_1} \restriction \bigcup_{\gamma, i} B_{\gamma, i} = H_{\delta_2} \restriction \bigcup_{\gamma, i} B_{\gamma, i}$ and $F_{\delta_1}(y \cap a_{\delta_1}^t) = F_{\delta_2}(y \cap a_{\delta_1}^t)$, for $t = 0, 1, y \in \bigcup_{\gamma, i} B_{\gamma, i}$ and $I_{\delta_1} \cap \bigcup_{\gamma, i} B_{\gamma, i} = I_{\delta_2} \cap \bigcup_{\gamma, i} B_{\gamma, i}$.

Let $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ be in S_4 and we get a contradiction.

2) In the proof of part (1) define, for $\gamma < \gamma(*)$ the colouring $c_\gamma : [S_4]^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ by:

for $\delta_0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2$ from S_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_\gamma\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2\} \text{ is } 0 &\text{ if } a_{\delta_2}^t \cap a_{\delta_0}^t < a_{\delta_2}^t \cap a_{\delta_1}^t, \text{ for } t = 0 \\ &1 \text{ if } a_{\delta_2}^t \cap a_{\delta_0}^t < a_{\delta_2}^t \cap a_{\delta_1}^t \text{ for } t = 1 \\ &\text{and it is not } 0 \\ &2 \text{ if otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, let $c : [S_1]^3 \rightarrow \gamma(*) + 1$ be:
for $\delta_0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2$ from S_1

$$\begin{aligned} c\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2\} \text{ is } (\gamma, t) &\text{ if } c_\gamma\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2\} = t \in \{0, 1\} \text{ \&} \\ &(\forall \gamma' < \gamma)[c_{\gamma'}\{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2\} = 2] \\ &\text{and is } (\gamma(*), 2) \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Now apply the partition property on S_4 (noting the “just” clauses in $(e)', (f)'$ in proof of part (1)). It is simpler to apply $\lambda^+ \rightarrow (\lambda^+, (\mu + 1)_\sigma)^3$. $\square_{3.3}$

3.4 Conclusion. 1) If $\kappa = \text{Depth}^+(B) + \text{ind}^+(B)$, then $|B| \leq d(B)^{<\kappa}$.

2)? If $|B| > |d(B)|^{<\text{ind}^+(B)}$, then for some $\sigma < \text{ind}^+(B)$ we have $\lambda < |B| \Rightarrow \lambda^+ \not\rightarrow (\text{Depth}^+(B))_\sigma^2$.

3.5 Remark. 1) Instead $\lambda = d(B)^{<\kappa}$ we can use $\lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$ such that:

- (*) there are no $\gamma^* < \kappa$ and $b_\gamma > 0$ (for $\gamma < \gamma^*$) and $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that for every $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+$, for some γ in $B \restriction b_\gamma$ we have $a_\gamma \cap a_\alpha \neq b_\gamma \cap a_\beta$ are disjoint or have disjoint complement.

2) Can think of parallel replacing in $(*)_2$ of 3.1(1), 2 by n , that is: let $2 \leq n < \omega$. We say $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$ is n -semi-independent (in the Boolean Algebra B) if some I witnesses it which means $a_\beta \in B$ are pairwise distinct and if for $\alpha \leq \gamma_0 < \dots < \gamma_{n-1}$ and $b \in \langle a_\beta : \beta < \alpha \rangle_B$ we have $(*)_1, (*)_3, (*)_4$ and

$(*)_{2,n}$ in $\{a_{\gamma_\ell} \cap b : \ell < n\}$ is independent in $B \upharpoonright b$.

There are some variants and I have not tried if this gives something interesting.

§4 ON OMITTING CARDINALS BY COMPACT SPACES

We continue Juhasz Shelah [JuSh 612]. We investigate what homomorphic images some Boolean Algebras may have, and (in 4.14) prove the topological analog of §2, showing the existence of some subspaces for Hausdorff spaces (not, necessarily compact).

4.1 Definition. 1) $\mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\mu]^{\leq \theta} \text{ and } (\forall X \in [\mu]^\theta)(\exists a \in \mathcal{P}) (|a \cap x| = \theta)\}.$

2) Let $\mathbf{a}_\theta(\mu) = \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^\theta \text{ is } \theta\text{-MAD}\}$ where $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^\theta$ is called θ -AD if $A \neq B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow |A \cap B| < \theta$ and we say $\mathcal{A}$ is θ -MAD means that in addition $\mathcal{A}$ is maximal under those restrictions.

4.2 Remark. In the case $\mu \geq 2^\theta$, in which we are interested, $\mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \mathbf{a}_\theta(\mu) = |\mathcal{A}|$ whenever $\mathcal{A}$ is θ -MAD for μ . (See more and connection of pcf theory [Sh 506], [Sh 589], but we do not use any non-trivial fact.)

4.3 Definition. 1) For $J_1 \subseteq J_2$ ideals of a Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$, we say J_2 is θ -full over J_1 inside $\mathcal{B}$, if for every $X \in [J_1]^\theta$ there is $b \in J_2$ such that $|\{x \in X : \mathcal{B} \models x \leq b\}| = \theta$.
 2) The ideal J of $\mathcal{B}$ is θ -full if: J is θ -full over J inside $\mathcal{B}$.
 3) J is τ -local inside $\mathcal{B}$, if $|\{b \in \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{B} \models b \leq x\}| \leq \tau$ for $x \in J$.
 4) In part (1), J_2 is strongly θ -full over J_1 inside $\mathcal{B}$ if for every $X \in [J_1]^\theta$ for some $Y \in [X]^\theta$, for every $Z \subseteq Y$ we have $\bigcup_{b \in Z} a \in \mathcal{B}$ in the sense of $\mathcal{B}$ exist. Similarly in part (2).

4.4 Fact: 1) If J_2 is θ -full over J_1 inside $\mathcal{B}$, h is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{B}$ onto $\mathcal{B}^*$ and $J_\ell^* = h(J_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, then J_2^* is θ -full over J_1^* inside $\mathcal{B}^*$.
 2) If J_2 is θ -full over J_1 inside $\mathcal{B}$ and J_2 is τ -local inside $\mathcal{B}$, then $\mathbf{U}_\theta(|J_1|) \leq \tau^\theta + |J_2|$.
 3) If the ideal J of $\mathcal{B}$ is θ -full and τ -local inside $\mathcal{B}$, then $\mathbf{U}_\theta(|J|) \leq \tau^\theta + |J|$.
 4) In parts 2) and 3), if $\tau = \theta$ we can replace τ^θ by τ .

Proof. 1) Trivial.

2) Let $J_1 = \{a_i : i < |J_1|\}$, let $\mathcal{P}_y = \{X \subseteq |J_1| : |X| = \theta \text{ and } (\forall i \in X)(\mathcal{B} \models a_i \leq y)\}$ for each $y \in J_2$, so $|\mathcal{P}_y| \leq \tau^\theta$. Lastly, let $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{P}_y : y \in J_2\}$ so $|\mathcal{P}| \leq |J_2| \times \sup_{y \in J_2} |\mathcal{P}_y| \leq \tau^\theta + |J_2|$. Easily $\mathcal{P}$ is as required in Definition 4.1.

3) Follows by part (2).

4) Similar to the proof of part (2) only now $\mathcal{P}_y = \{\{i < |J_1| : \mathcal{B} \models a_i \leq y\}\}$. $\square_{4.4}$

4.5 Fact: 1) Assume $\lambda < \kappa \leq \mu \leq \kappa^\lambda$ and $\Theta \subseteq \Theta_{\mu, \lambda} =: \{\theta \leq \lambda : \mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \mu\}$ and let $\sigma \in \{\sigma : \sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) \leq \lambda^+ \text{ and for every } \theta \in \Theta \text{ we have } \text{cf}(\theta) \neq \sigma\}$, (clearly there is one: $\sigma = \lambda^+$). Then there is a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ such that

- (a) $|\mathcal{B}| = \mu$
- (b) $\mathcal{B}$ is atomic with exactly κ atoms

- (c) $\mathcal{B}$ has a maximal ideal J which is 2^λ -local, moreover $x \in J \Rightarrow |\{y : \mathcal{B} \models "y \leq x \ \& \ y \text{ an atom (of } \mathcal{B})"$ $\}| \leq \lambda$
- (d) for every $\theta \in \Theta$, J is θ -full (inside $\mathcal{B}$)
- (e) if $2^\lambda \leq \mu$ then $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to some $\mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \{x : x \leq a\}$
(so can demand $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\kappa), J \subseteq [\kappa]^{\leq \lambda}$).
If $2^\lambda > \mu$, $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ has cardinality $\leq \mu$ we can replace above $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ by $\mathcal{B}_0$.

2) We can add in part (2)

- (f) if $x \in J$ and $a_i \leq x$ is an atom of $\mathcal{B}$ for $i < i^* \leq \lambda$, then some $y \in \mathcal{B}$ is $\bigcup_{i < i^*} a_i$ in $\mathcal{B}$'s sense
- (g) $2^\lambda \leq \mu$ & $\theta \in \Theta \Rightarrow J$ is strongly θ -full inside $\mathcal{B}$, in fact $2^\lambda \leq \mu$ & $x \in J \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(x) \subseteq J$.

Proof. 1) Below if $2^\lambda > \mu$ we should replace everywhere “ J_ζ is the ideal of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ such that ...” by “ J_ζ is the Boolean subring of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ such that”; if $2^\lambda \leq \mu$ we may or may not. As $\mu \leq \kappa^\lambda$ we can find pairwise distinct $x_i \in [\kappa]^\lambda$ for $i < \mu$, $x_0 = \{i : i < \lambda\}$. Let J_0 be the ideal of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ generated by $\{x_i : i < \mu\} \cup \{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \kappa\} \cup \mathcal{B}_0$, so $J_0 \subseteq [\kappa]^{\leq \lambda}$, $|J_0| = \mu$. We choose by induction on $\zeta \leq \sigma$, an ideal J_ζ of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, $J_\zeta \subseteq [\kappa]^{\leq \lambda}$, $|J_\zeta| = \mu$, J_ζ is increasing continuous in ζ . For $\zeta = 0$, J_0 was defined, for ζ limit let $J_\zeta = \bigcup_{\varepsilon < \zeta} J_\varepsilon$. For $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1$, let $J_\varepsilon = \{a_i^\varepsilon : i < \mu\}$, for $\theta \in \Theta$

let $\mathcal{P}_\theta^\varepsilon \subseteq [\mu]^{\leq \theta}$ exemplifies $\mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \mu$ (which follows from $\theta \in \Theta$), so $|\mathcal{P}_\theta^\varepsilon| \leq \mu$, and let J_ζ be the ideal of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ generated by $J_\varepsilon \cup \{\bigcup_{i \in x} a_i^\varepsilon : x \in \mathcal{P}_\theta^\varepsilon \text{ for some } \theta \in \Theta\}$,

easy to check the inductive demand. It is also easy to check that then $J_{\zeta+1}$ is θ -full over J_ζ (inside $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$), when $\theta \in \Theta$. Let $J = J_\sigma$, $B = J \cup \{\kappa \setminus x : x \in J\}$ = the Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ which J generates. Clearly J is θ -full over J inside $\mathcal{B}$. (If $\sigma = \lambda^+$, if $X \subseteq J$, $|X| \leq \lambda$, then for some $\zeta < \lambda^+$ we have $X \subseteq J_\zeta$, so $|X| \in \Theta \Rightarrow (\exists y \in J_{\zeta+1})[|X| = |\{x \in X : B \models x \in y\}|]$. If $\sigma < \lambda^+$ and $|X| \in \Theta$, then for some $\zeta < \sigma$, $|X \cap J_\zeta| = \theta$ and proved as above.) So easily $\mathcal{B}, J$ are as required.

2) Should be clear. □_{4.5}

4.6 Claim. 1) If $\mathcal{B}, J$ (and κ, μ, Θ) are as in fact 4.5(2), and $\mathcal{B}^*$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| \geq 2^\lambda$, then $\theta \in \Theta \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_\theta(\|\mathcal{B}^*\|) = \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$.

2) Hence if $\theta \in \Theta$, $2^\lambda \leq \chi < \kappa$, $(\forall \alpha < \chi)(|\alpha|^{<\theta} < \chi \ \& \ \text{cf}(\chi) = \theta)$, then $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| \notin [\chi, \chi^\theta]$.

3) Also it follows that the number of ultrafilters of $\mathcal{B}^*$ is $\leq 2^{2^\lambda} + \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$, if $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| > 2^\lambda$ & $\lambda \in \Theta$ equality holds (in any case $\geq \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$).

Proof. Let $h^* : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^*$ be a homomorphism from $\mathcal{B}$ onto $\mathcal{B}^*$, let $J^* = \{h^*(x) : x \in J\}$. First assume $1_{\mathcal{B}^*} \in J^*$, this means that for some $x \in J$, $h^*(x) = 1_{\mathcal{B}^*}$, so $\mathcal{B} \upharpoonright x =: \mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \{y : \mathcal{B} \models y \leq x\}$ has $\mathcal{B}^*$ as a homomorphic image so $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| \leq |\mathcal{P}(x)| \leq 2^\lambda$, and the number of ultrafilters of $\mathcal{B}^*$ is $\leq 2^{2^\lambda}$; also if

$\|\mathcal{B}^*\| \geq 2^\lambda$ we get $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| = 2^\lambda$ hence $\mathfrak{a}_\theta(\|\mathcal{B}^*\|) = \mathfrak{a}_\theta(2^\lambda) = 2^\lambda$ as $(2^\lambda)^\theta = 2^\lambda$; this finishes except the other inequalities in part (3). So assume $1_{\mathcal{B}^*} \notin J^*$, hence J^* is a maximal ideal of $\mathcal{B}^*$, also clearly J^* is θ -full inside $\mathcal{B}^*$ for every $\theta \in \Theta$ (by Fact 4.4(1)). As J is 2^λ -local (see Fact 4.5(c)), clearly J^* is 2^λ -local, hence by 4.4(2), (letting $\chi = |J^*|$ we have), $\mathfrak{a}_\theta(\chi) \leq (2^\lambda)^\theta + \chi$, but $\mathfrak{a}_\theta(\chi) \geq \chi \geq 2^\lambda = (2^\lambda)^\theta$ so $\mathfrak{a}_\theta(\chi) = \chi$. Also $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| = \chi + \chi = \chi$. So we have gotten the conclusion of 4.6(1). Now 4.6(2) follows easily as $\mathfrak{a}_\theta(\chi) \geq \chi^\theta$ as $\{\eta \restriction \alpha : \alpha < \theta\} : \eta \in \chi^\theta\}$ is a θ -AD family of subsets of $\{\eta : \eta \in {}^{>\theta}\chi\}$ which has cardinality χ^θ . Lastly, for 4.6(3), if D is an ultrafilter of $\mathcal{B}^*$ then either $D = \mathcal{B}^* \setminus J^*$ or for some $x \in J^*, x \in D$ but for each $x \in J^*, \mathcal{B}^* \restriction \{y \in \mathcal{B}^* : y \leq x\}$ has $\leq 2^\lambda$ members so the number of ultrafilters of $\mathcal{B}$ to which x belongs is $\leq 2^{2^\lambda}$, that means

Fact: If the Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$ has a τ -local maximal ideal, then
 $|\{\text{set of ultrafilters of } \mathcal{B}^*\}| \leq 2^\tau + \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$.

Last point is the second inequality in part (3); assume $\mu = \|\mathcal{B}^*\| > 2^\lambda$. Let $x_i \in J$ for $i < \mu$ be such that $i < j < \tau \Rightarrow h^*(x_i) \neq h^*(x_j)$ (possible as $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| = |J^*|$). So by the Δ -system argument without loss of generality for some $x^*, i < j < (2^\lambda)^+ \Rightarrow x_i \cap x_j = x^*$. But $\langle h^*(x_i) \cap h^*(x^*) : i < (2^\lambda)^+ \rangle$ is constant hence $\langle h^*(x_i - x^*) : i < (2^\lambda)^+ \rangle$ is a sequence of $(2^\lambda)^+$ pairwise disjoint non-zero (in the sense of $\mathcal{B}^*$) members of $\mathcal{B}^*$. We can find $y \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $w = \{i < (2^\lambda)^+ : x_i - x^* \leq y\}$ has cardinality λ (remember $\lambda \in \Theta$ by assumption of 4.6(3)), hence $(\forall u \subseteq w)(\exists z \in \mathcal{B})([i \in u \Rightarrow x_i - x^* \leq z] \ \& \ [i \in w \setminus u \Rightarrow (x_i, x^*) \cap z = 0])$ hence $\mathcal{B}^*$ has a homomorphic image isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ hence $\mathcal{B}$ has $\geq 2^{2^\lambda}$ ultrafilters. Together we finish. $\square_{4.6}$

* * *

By claims 4.5, 4.6 we really finish. Let me point some specific conclusions: conclusion 4.7 is the theorem of Juhasz Shelah [JuSh 612].

4.7 Conclusion. For every $\kappa > 2^\lambda$, there is a Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ such that: $\mathcal{B}_\kappa$ is atomic with κ atoms, $\|\mathcal{B}\| = \kappa^\lambda$ and for every homomorphic image $\mathcal{B}^*$ of $\mathcal{B}$ of cardinality $\chi > 2^\lambda$ we have $\chi = \chi^\lambda$ and the number of ultrafilters of $\mathcal{B}^*$ is $2^{2^\lambda} + \chi$ in particular $\chi \in [\kappa, \kappa^\lambda)$ is impossible. (Check).

Proof. We apply fact 4.5 + claim 4.6 to $\mu = \kappa^\lambda$ and our κ , so $\Theta = \{\theta : \theta \leq \lambda\}$. So in Θ we get $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{B}^*$ be a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{B}$ (equivalently, a quotient of $\mathcal{B}$) and $\chi = \|\mathcal{B}^*\| > 2^\lambda$. So $\theta \in \Theta \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_\theta(\chi) = \chi$, now if $\chi < \chi^\lambda$ let $\sigma = \text{Min}\{\theta : \chi^\theta = \chi\}$, so $\sigma \in \Theta$ and $\chi^{<\sigma} = \chi < \chi^\sigma$ and we get a contradiction to $\mathbf{U}_\sigma(\chi) = \chi$. For the number of ultrafilters use 4.6(3). $\square_{4.7}$

4.8 Conclusion. If λ is strong limit singular (e.g. $\beth_\omega$) and $2^\lambda < \kappa \leq \mu \leq \kappa^\lambda$, then there is an (atomic) Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$ with κ atoms, $|\mathcal{B}| = \mu$ such that: for every large enough regular $\theta < \lambda$ we have:

every homomorphic image $\mathcal{B}^*$ of $\mathcal{B}$ of cardinality $> (2^\lambda)^+$ satisfies $\mathfrak{a}_\theta[\|\mathcal{B}^*\|] = \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$
(so for any cardinality τ , we have $\|\mathcal{B}^*\| \in [\tau^{<\theta}, \tau^\theta)$ is impossible).

Proof. By conclusion 4.5 + 4.6 using [Sh 460].

4.9 Remark. In addition to $\mathbf{U}_\theta(-)$ we can use other functions (e.g. as in [Sh 589, §1], even if their number is $> \mu$ it does not matter as for each $\chi \in (2^\lambda, \mu)$ we can choose one) but does not seem worth elaborating.

4.10 Remark. 1) Assume κ is strong limit singular of cofinality $\theta^* < \lambda < \kappa$ and $2^\kappa = \kappa^\lambda > \kappa$. There are many $\mu \in [\kappa, 2^\kappa)$ such that $\Theta_{\mu, \lambda} = \{\theta \leq \lambda : \text{cf}(\theta) \neq \theta^*\}$. E.g. $\mu \in \{\kappa^{+\omega} : \omega < \omega\}$, also (see [Sh:g, Ch.IX]) for a club E of λ^{+4} , $\delta \in E$ & $\text{cf}(\delta) \geq \lambda^+$ & $\omega < \omega \Rightarrow \Theta_{\kappa^{+\delta+\omega}, \lambda} = \{\theta \leq \lambda : \text{cf}(\theta) \neq \theta^*\}$.

4.11 Claim. In Claim 4.6 we can add (see [Sh 460])

- (a) if $\theta \leq \lambda$ and $\mu = \mu^{[\theta]}$ then $\|\mathcal{B}^*\|^{[\theta]} = \|\mathcal{B}^*\|$
- (b) similar more general condition (see [Sh 589, §1, end]).

4.12 Conclusion. If μ is strongly limit singular and $\text{cf}(\mu) \leq \theta < \mu$, then for some atomic Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$ we have:

- (a) $\mathcal{B}$ has cardinality μ
- (b) $\mathcal{B}$ has μ ultrafilters
- (c) if $\mathcal{B}^*$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{B}$ of singular strong limit cardinality $\chi > \theta$, then $\text{cf}(\chi) = \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{B}^*$ has χ ultrafilters
- (d) if $\mathcal{B}^*$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathcal{B}$, $\chi = \|\mathcal{B}^*\| > 2^\lambda$, then $\chi^{<\text{cf}(\mu)} = \chi$ and $\chi = \text{cov}(\chi, \theta^+, \theta^+, (\text{cf}(\mu))^+)$.

Proof. By 4.6 and 4.11.

Another example

4.13 Conclusion. If μ is strong limit singular, $\theta = \text{cf}(\delta) < \text{cf}(\mu)$, $\mu^{+\delta} < 2^\mu$, $(\mu^{+\delta})^{<\theta} = \mu^{+\delta}$, then for some Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$ of cardinality $\mu^{+\delta}$ it has $\mu^{+\delta}$ ultrafilters, and for every homomorphic image $\mathcal{B}^*$ of $\mathcal{B}$ of cardinality χ , $2^{\text{cf}(\mu)} < \chi < \mu$ we have:

- (*) if χ is strong limit then $\text{cf}(\chi) \in \{\text{cf}(\mu), \text{cf}(\delta)\}$.

4.14 Claim. Assume

- (a) λ is strong limit singular, $\kappa = \lambda$, $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu \leq \lambda$
- (b) X is a Hausdorff topological space with $w(X) = \lambda$.

Then X has a closed subset Y such that:

- (α) $\mu \leq w(B) \leq 2^{<\mu}$
- (β) $\mu \leq |Y| \leq \sum_{\theta < \mu} 2^{2^\theta}$.

Remark. 1) If we speak on Boolean Algebras $\mathcal{B}$, let $X = \text{Ult}(\mathcal{B})$, so $w(X) = |\mathcal{B}|$ and $\{Y : Y \subseteq X \text{ closed}\} = \{\text{Ult}(\mathcal{B}/I) : I \text{ and ideal of } \mathcal{B}\}$ essentially.
 2) So this result reasonably compliments Juhasz [Ju1], Juhasz Shelah [JuSh 612].

Proof. Case 1: $\mu = \lambda$.

Let $W = \{U_i : i < \lambda\}$ be a basis of X . Choose $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing continuously with limit λ , $\lambda_0 = 0$, $(\forall \sigma < \lambda_{i+1})[\sigma^{\lambda_i} < \lambda_{i+1} = \text{cf}(\lambda_{i+1})]$. As $|X| \geq \lambda$ (as $w(X) = \lambda$) necessarily $s^+(X) > \lambda$, see Juhasz [Ju] so there is $\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq X$, (with no repetitions) which is discrete. We can choose $Z_i \in [\lambda_{i+1}]^{\lambda_{i+1}}$ such that

$$(\forall \alpha < \lambda_i) \left(\bigwedge_{\zeta \in Z_i} y_\zeta \in U_\alpha \vee \bigwedge_{\zeta \in Z_i} y_\zeta \notin U_\alpha \right).$$

By renaming without loss of generality $Z_i = [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1})$. Let $Y = \text{cl}\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$. It suffices to prove that $|Y^*| = \lambda$, for this it suffices to prove

(*) if $x \in Y^*$, then for some $i < \kappa$ we have

$$x \in \text{cl}(\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_i\} \cup \{y_{\lambda_j} : j < \kappa\}).$$

If x contradicts (*), then for every $i < \lambda$ there is $\alpha_i < \lambda$ such that $x \in U_{\alpha_i}, U_{\alpha_i} \cap (\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_i\} \cup \{y_{\lambda_j} : j < \kappa\}) = \emptyset$.

Now $\alpha_i < \lambda = \bigcup_{j < \kappa} \lambda_j$ so for some j , $\alpha_i < \lambda_j$, so $U_{\alpha_i} \cap U_{\alpha_j}$ is an open neighborhood of x (as $U_{\alpha_i}, U_{\alpha_j}$ are) disjoint to $\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_j\}$ as U_{α_j} is, and for each $\beta \in [\lambda_j, \lambda)$ we have

(*) for some $\zeta \in [j, \kappa)$, $\lambda_\zeta \leq \beta < \lambda_{\zeta+1}$ and so (as $\alpha_i < \lambda_j, j \leq \zeta$) we have $y_\beta \in U_{\alpha_i} \Leftrightarrow y_{\lambda_\zeta} \in U_{\alpha_i}$; but $y_{\lambda_\zeta} \notin U_{\alpha_i}$ by the choice of U_{α_i} , hence

$$\beta \in [\lambda_j, \lambda) \Rightarrow y_\beta \notin U_{\alpha_i} \Rightarrow y_\beta \notin U_{\alpha_i} \cap U_{\alpha_j}.$$

So $U_{\alpha_i} \cap U_{\alpha_j}$ is an open neighborhood of x disjoint to $\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ so $x \notin Y^*$, contradiction so (*) holds, hence we are done.

Case 2: $\mu < \lambda$.

Let $\mu = \sum_{i < \kappa} \mu_i$, μ_i strictly increasing with i . Repeat the above and let

$$Y' = \text{cl}\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i) \text{ for some } i\}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} y \in Y' &\Rightarrow y \in \text{cl}\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \bigcup_{i < \kappa} [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i)\} \\ &\Rightarrow \bigvee_{j < \kappa} x \in \text{cl}(\{y_\alpha : \alpha \in \bigcup_{i < j} [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i)\} \cup \{y_{\lambda_i} : i < \kappa\}). \end{aligned}$$

So clearly $\mu = \sum_{i < \kappa} \mu_i \leq |Y'| \leq \sum_{i < \kappa} 2^{2^{\mu_i}}$.

Now a basis of Y' is $\bigcup_{\substack{j < \kappa \\ A \subseteq \kappa}} W_{j,A}$ where

$$W_{j,A} = \left\{ U_\alpha \cap Y' : \alpha < \lambda_j \text{ and } [i \in [j, \kappa) \cap A \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{\alpha \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i)} y_\alpha \in U_\alpha] \right. \\ \left. \text{and } [i \in [j, \kappa) \setminus A \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\alpha \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i)} y_\alpha \notin U_\alpha] \right\}.$$

So considering $W_{j,\kappa}$ we can look at the space $Y_j = cl(\{y_\alpha : \alpha < \bigcup_{i < j} [\lambda_i, \lambda_i + \mu_i)\} \cup \{y_{\lambda_i} : i < \kappa\})$, which has density $\leq \mu_j + \kappa_i = \mu_i$ hence witness weight $\leq 2^{\mu_j}$, so we can finish easily. $\square_{4.14}$

We may consider this in the framework

4.15 Definition. 1) For a Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{B}$ let

$$wcSp(B) = \{(\|\mathcal{B}'\|, \text{ult}(\mathcal{B}')) : \mathcal{B}' \text{ is an infinite homomorphic image of } \mathcal{B}\}$$

(remember

$$\text{ult}(\mathcal{B}') = |\text{Ult}(\mathcal{B}')|, \text{Ult}(B') = \{D : D \text{ an ultrafilter of } \mathcal{B}'\}.$$

2) For a topological space X let

$$wcSp(X) = \{(|Y|, w(Y)) : Y \text{ is a closed subspace of } X\}.$$

(remember $w(X)$ is the weight of the topological space X).

4.16 Remark. Of course, we can use disjoint sums of Boolean Algebras to get more examples (and similarly for topological spaces) as

$$wcSp\left(\sum_{i < \alpha} B_i\right) = \left\{ \left(\sum_{i < \alpha} \lambda_i, 1 + \sum_{i < \alpha} \mu_i \right) : (\lambda_i, \mu_i) \in wcSp(B_i) \right. \\ \left. \cup \{(2^n, 2^{2^n}) : n < \omega\} \cup \{(0, 0) \right. \\ \left. \text{for } i < \alpha \text{ and } \sum_{i < \alpha} \lambda_i \text{ is infinite} \} \right\}.$$

In this way we can get more examples from the ones from [JuSh 612], but this does not cover all the above.

§5 DEPTH OF ULTRAPRODUCTS OF BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

5.1 Claim. Assume $\square_\lambda$ (i.e. there is $\langle C_\delta : \delta < \lambda^+ \text{ limit} \rangle$ such that C_δ is a club of δ of order type $< \delta$ if $\text{cf}(\delta) < \delta$ and $\delta_1 \in \text{acc}(C_{\delta_2}) \Rightarrow C_{\delta_1} = C_{\delta_2} \cap \delta_1$).
Let $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) < \lambda$. Then there are Boolean Algebras B_ε for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ such that:

- (a) $\text{Depth}(B_\varepsilon) \leq \lambda$
- (b) for any uniform ultrafilter D on κ , $\lambda^+ \leq \text{Depth}(\prod_{\varepsilon < \kappa} B_\varepsilon / D)$.

5.2 Remark. This can be expressed through §1, see later.

Proof. Let $\langle C_\delta : \delta < \lambda^+ \text{ limit} \rangle$ exemplify $\square_\lambda$ so there are an ordinal γ^* and a stationary $S \subseteq \lambda^+$ such that $(\forall \alpha \in S)[\text{otp}(C_\alpha) = \gamma^*]$ (so $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow \alpha$ limit and), $\text{cf}(\gamma^*) = \kappa$ and γ^* divisible by ω^2 . So without loss of generality for every δ , $C_\delta \cap S = \emptyset$ (by deleting the first $\gamma^* + 1$ elements from any C_δ of greater order type) also without loss of generality $[\alpha \in C_\alpha \setminus \text{acc}(C_\alpha) \Rightarrow \alpha \text{ non-limit}]$.

5.3 Fact: Under the assumptions of 5.1 there are sets $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} (\alpha < \lambda^+, \varepsilon < \kappa)$ such that:

- (i) $\varepsilon < \zeta \Rightarrow A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \subseteq A_{\alpha,\zeta}$
- (ii) $\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \kappa} A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \alpha$
- (iii) $\beta \in A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \Rightarrow A_{\beta,\varepsilon} = A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \cap \beta$
- (iv) $\alpha \in S \ \& \ \varepsilon < \kappa \Rightarrow \sup(A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}) < \alpha$
- (v) $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ is a closed subset of α and disjoint to S
- (vi) if $\beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha)$ then $\beta \in A_{\alpha,0}$
- (vii) $\beta \in A_{\beta+1,0}$.

Proof of 5.3. We choose by induction $\alpha < \lambda^+$ a sequence $\langle A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ such that clauses (i)-(vii) holds.

Let $\langle \gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing continuous in ε sequence of ordinals with limit γ^* , each γ_ε a limit ordinal.

How do we carry the definition?

Case 1: $\alpha = 0$.

Let $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \emptyset$.

Case 2: $\alpha = \beta + 1$.

Let $A_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = A_{\beta,\varepsilon} \cup \{\beta\}$.

Case 3: α limit, $\alpha > \sup(\text{acc}(C_\alpha))$.

So necessarily $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_0$. Let $\beta_0 \in C_\alpha$ and $\beta_0 = \max(\text{acc } C_\alpha)$ if $\text{acc}(C_\alpha) \neq \emptyset$. Choose β_n (for $n \in [1, \omega)$) such that $n \geq 0 \Rightarrow \beta_n < \beta_{n+1}, \beta_n \in C_\alpha, \alpha = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \beta_n$.

Choose $\varepsilon_n < \kappa$ such that $\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon_{n+1}, \beta_n \in A_{\beta_{n+1}, \varepsilon_{n+1}}$. Lastly, for $\varepsilon < \kappa$ we let $A_{\alpha, \varepsilon}$ be: $\bigcup \{\{\beta_n\} \cup A_{\beta_n, \varepsilon} : n \text{ satisfies } \varepsilon_n \leq \varepsilon\}$.

Now check.

Case 4: α limit, $\alpha = \sup(\text{acc } C_\alpha), \alpha \notin S$.

Let $A_{\alpha, \varepsilon} = \bigcup \{A_{\beta, \varepsilon} : \beta \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha)\}$.

Remember that $C_\delta \cap S = \emptyset$ for every limit $\delta < \lambda^+$.

Case 5: α limit, $\alpha = \sup(\text{acc } C_\alpha), \alpha \in S$.

Let $A_{\alpha, \varepsilon} = A_{\beta_\varepsilon, \varepsilon}$ where β_ε is the γ_ε -th member of C_α (so necessarily $\beta_\varepsilon \in \text{acc}(C_\alpha)$) and $\xi < \zeta \Rightarrow C_{\beta_\xi} = C_{\beta_\zeta} \cap \beta_\varepsilon \Rightarrow (\forall \varepsilon)[(A_{\beta_\xi, \varepsilon} = A_{\beta_\zeta, \varepsilon} \cap \beta_\varepsilon)]$.

Check. $\square_{5.3}$

5.4 Remark. This is relevant to a problem from [Sh 108].

Continuation of the proof of 5.1. Let $<_\varepsilon$ be the following two place relation on $\lambda^+ : \alpha <_\varepsilon \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \in A_{\beta, \varepsilon}$. It is a partial order (by clause (iii) of 5.3). Also $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \bigvee_{\zeta < \kappa} \bigwedge_{\varepsilon \in [\zeta, \kappa)} \alpha <_\varepsilon \beta$ by clauses (i) + (ii) of 5.3. Let B_ε be $BA[(\lambda^+, <_\varepsilon)]$,

i.e. it is a Boolean Algebra generated by $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ freely except

$$\otimes x_\alpha \leq x_\beta \text{ when } \alpha <_\varepsilon \beta.$$

Clearly if D is a filter on κ containing the co-bounded subsets of κ then $\text{Depth}^+(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D) >$

λ^+ as $\langle x_\alpha : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle / D : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ exemplifies this. Assume toward contradiction $\text{Depth}^+(B_\varepsilon) > \lambda^+$ so assume $\bar{b} = \langle b_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is (strictly) increasing in B_ε . Choose by induction on $\gamma < \lambda^+$ a model $M_\gamma \prec (\mathcal{H}(\lambda^{++}), \in, <_{\lambda^{++}}^*)$ of cardinality λ increasing continuous in γ such that $\{\bar{C}, <_\varepsilon, \bar{b}\} \in M_0$ and $\langle M_\beta : \beta \leq \gamma \rangle \in M_{\gamma+1}$. So $C^* = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : M_\delta \cap \lambda^+ = \delta\}$ is a club of λ^+ so choose $\delta(*) \in S \cap \text{acc}(C^*)$.

Let $b_\gamma = \tau(x_{\alpha(\gamma, 0)}, \dots, x_{\alpha(\gamma, n_\gamma - 1)})$ with $\alpha(\gamma, 0) < \alpha(\gamma, 1) < \dots < \alpha(\gamma, n_\gamma - 1) < \lambda^+$, and for $Y \subseteq \lambda^+$ let $B_{\varepsilon, Y}$ be the subalgebra of B_ε generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}$. Easily

(*) $B_{\varepsilon, Y}$ is the algebra generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in Y\}$ freely except $x_\alpha \leq x_\beta$ when $\alpha <_\varepsilon \beta$ & $\alpha \in Y$ & $\beta \in Y$, i.e. $B_{\varepsilon, Y} = BA[(Y, <_\varepsilon \upharpoonright Y)]$.

Clearly by clause (ii) for some $\zeta_\ell < \kappa$ we have $\alpha(\delta(*), \varepsilon) > \delta(*) \Rightarrow \delta(*) \in A_{\alpha(\delta(*), \ell), \zeta_\ell}$ and $\alpha(\delta(*), \varepsilon) < \delta(*) \Rightarrow \alpha(\delta(*), \ell) \in A_{\delta(*), \zeta_\ell}$ and let $\xi = \max\{\varepsilon\} \cup \{\zeta_\ell : \ell < n_{\delta(*)}\}$, so $\delta(*) \cap \bigcup_{\ell < n_{\delta(*)}} A_{\alpha(\delta(*), \ell), \varepsilon} \subseteq A_{\delta(*), \xi}$.

Let $\alpha_0(*) = \sup(\delta(*) \cap \bigcup_{\ell < n_{\delta(*)}} A_{\alpha(\delta(*), \ell), \varepsilon})$, now as $\delta(*) \in S, n_{\delta(*)} < \omega, A_{\delta(*), \xi}$ is

closed and clause (iv) of 5.3 we have $\delta(*) > \sup(A_{\delta(*), \xi})$ hence clearly $\alpha_0(*) < \delta(*)$. Let $\alpha(*) = \text{Min}(C^* \setminus \alpha_0(*))$ so $\alpha(*) < \delta(*)$ (as $\delta(*) \in \text{acc } C^*$). Let $Y_0 = \alpha(*)$, $Y_1 = \delta(*), Y_2 = \alpha(*) \cup \{\alpha(\delta(*), 0), \dots, \alpha(\delta(*), n_{\delta(*)} - 1)\}$.

Easily: $Y_0 = Y_1 \cap Y_2, Y_1 \cup Y_2 \subseteq \lambda^+$ and

$$\beta_1 \in Y_1 \setminus Y_2 \ \& \ \beta_2 \in Y_2 \setminus Y_1 \Rightarrow (\beta_1, \beta_2 \text{ are } <_\varepsilon \text{-incomparable}).$$

By (*) above and the definition of C^* clearly:

- (a) $B_{\varepsilon, Y_1 \cup Y_2}$ is the free product of B_{ε, Y_1} and B_{ε, Y_2} over B_{ε, Y_0}
- (b) $b_{\delta(*)} \notin M_{\delta(*)}, B_\varepsilon \upharpoonright M_{\delta(*)} = B_{\varepsilon, Y_1}$ so $b_{\delta(*)} \notin B_{\varepsilon, Y_1}$ hence $b_{\delta(*)} \notin B_{\varepsilon, Y_0}$
- (c) $b_{\alpha(*)} \notin M_{\alpha(*)}, B_\varepsilon \upharpoonright M_{\alpha(*)} = B_{\varepsilon, Y_0}$ so $b_{\alpha(*)} \notin B_{\varepsilon, Y_0}$.

But by the choice of $\bar{b}, B_\varepsilon \models b_{\alpha(*)} < b_{\delta(*)}$ hence $B_{\varepsilon, Y_1 \cup Y_2} \models b_{\alpha(*)} < b_{\delta(*)}$ hence by clause (a) for some $c \in B_{\varepsilon, Y_0}$ we have $B_{\varepsilon, Y_1} \models b_{\alpha(*)} \leq c$ and $B_{\varepsilon, Y_2} \models c \leq b_{\delta(*)}$. So $c \in M_{\alpha(*)}$ and $\alpha(*) \in Z = \{\alpha : b_\alpha \leq c\}$, this last set Z is an initial segment of λ^+ , it belongs to $M_{\alpha(*)}$, hence its supremum belongs to $M_{\alpha(*)}$, but the supremum $\in \{\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda^+\}$, and is not in λ^+ (as $M_{\alpha(*)} \cap \lambda^+ = \alpha(*)$ and $\alpha(*)$ belongs to the set), so $Z = \lambda^+$. So $B_\varepsilon \models b_{\delta(*)} \leq c$ but (by its choice) $B_\varepsilon \models c \leq b_{\delta(*)}$ so $c = b_{\delta(*)}$, but $c \in M_{\alpha(*)} \prec M_{\delta(*)}, b_{\delta(*)} \notin M_{\delta(*)}$, contradiction. $\square_{5.1}$

5.5 Conclusion: Under the assumption of claim 5.1

- (a) we can find $\mathbf{c} : [\lambda]^2 \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $\boxtimes_{\lambda, \lambda, \theta}$ (from 1.5)
- (b) $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, \kappa)$ (see Definition 1.10(2), in fact $NQs_2(\lambda, \mu, A, I)$ where A is the interval Boolean Algebra of $\kappa, I = \{a \in A : \sup(a) < \kappa\}$).

Proof. Easy, e.g.

- (a) let $\langle \langle A_{\alpha, \varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be as in the proof of 5.1. Let for $\alpha < \beta$

$$\mathbf{c}\{\alpha, \beta\} =: \text{Min}\{\varepsilon : \alpha \in A_{\beta, \varepsilon}\}.$$

5.6 Remark. For κ singular we can deduce 5.1 straightforwardly.

REFERENCES.

- [GiSh 344] Moti Gitik and Saharon Shelah. On certain indestructibility of strong cardinals and a question of Hajnal. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **28**:35–42, 1989.
- [JMMP] Thomas Jech, Menachem Magidor, William Mitchell, and Karel Prikry. On precipitous ideals. *J. of Symb. Logic*, **45**:1–8, 1980.
- [Ju] Istvan Juhász. Cardinal functions. II. In *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, pages 63–109. North Holland Publ. Co, 1984.
- [Ju1] Istvan Juhász. On the weight spectrum of a compact spaces. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **81**:369–379, 1993.
- [JuSh 612] Istvan Juhász and Saharon Shelah. On the cardinality and weight spectra of compact spaces, II. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **accepted**.
- [M] Donald Monk. Cardinal functions of Boolean algebras. circulated notes.
- [RoSh 599] Andrzej Rosłanowski and Saharon Shelah. More on cardinal functions on Boolean algebras. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **accepted**.
- [Sh:E11] S. Shelah. An answer to complaints of E.Weitz on [Sh:371] and other complaints on [Sh:g].
- [Sh 506] Saharon Shelah. In *The Mathematics of Paul Erdős, II*.
- [Sh 641] Saharon Shelah. Constructing Boolean algebras for cardinal invariants. *Algebra Universalis*, **submitted**.
- [Sh:e] Saharon Shelah. *Non-structure theory*, accepted. Oxford University Press.
- [Sh 589] Saharon Shelah. PCF theory: applications. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **submitted**.
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **accepted**.
- [Sh 546] Saharon Shelah. Was Sierpiński right? IV. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **accepted**.
- [Sh 108] Saharon Shelah. On successors of singular cardinals. In *Logic Colloquium '78 (Mons, 1978)*, volume 97 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math*, pages 357–380. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1979.
- [Sh:92] Saharon Shelah. Remarks on Boolean algebras. *Algebra Universalis*, **11**:77–89, 1980.
- [Sh:b] Saharon Shelah. *Proper forcing*, volume 940 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, xxix+496 pp, 1982.
- [Sh 233] Saharon Shelah. Remarks on the numbers of ideals of Boolean algebra and open sets of a topology. In *Around classification theory of models*, volume 1182 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 151–187. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

- [Sh 88a] Saharon Shelah. Appendix: on stationary sets (in “Classification of nonelementary classes. II. Abstract elementary classes”). In *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 483–495. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.
- [Sh 276] Saharon Shelah. Was Sierpiński right? I. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **62**:355–380, 1988.
- [Sh 420] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.).
- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh 454a] Saharon Shelah. Cardinalities of topologies with small base. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **68**:95–113, 1994.
- [Sh 462] Saharon Shelah. On σ -entangled linear orders. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **153**:199–275, 1997.
- [Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.